

COUNCIL MEETING

10 December 2014

COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

1. Council - 1 October 2014 (Pages 1 - 8)
2. Executive - 30 September 2014 (Pages 9 - 14)
3. Executive - 21 October 2014 (Pages 15 - 52)
4. Executive - 11 November 2014 (Pages 53 - 60)
5. Executive - 2 December 2014 To be laid on the table
6. Planning Applications Committee - 22 September 2014 (Pages 61 - 74)
7. Planning Applications Committee - 22 October 2014 (Pages 75 - 86)
8. Planning Applications Committee - 17 November 2014 (Pages 87 - 104)
9. Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee - Scrutiny Meeting - 24 September 2014 (Pages 105 - 110)
10. Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee - Scrutiny Meeting - 5 November 2014 (Pages 111 - 118)
11. External Partnerships Select Committee - 25 November 2014 (Pages 119 - 124)
12. Joint Staff Consultative Group - 27 November 2014 (Pages 125 - 126)
13. Community Services Scrutiny Committee - 4 December 2014 To be laid on the table
14. Review of Exempt Items (Pages 127 - 128)

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on
1 October 2014**

+ Cllr Bob Paton (Mayor)
+ Cllr Joanne Potter (Deputy Mayor)

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| - Cllr David Allen | + Cllr Edward Hawkins |
| + Cllr Rodney Bates | + Cllr Josephine Hawkins |
| + Cllr Richard Brooks | - Cllr Paul Ilnicki |
| + Cllr Keith Bush | - Cllr Lexie Kemp |
| Cllr Glyn Carpenter | + Cllr Bruce Mansell |
| + Cllr Bill Chapman | + Cllr David Mansfield |
| + Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr John May |
| + Cllr Ian Cullen | + Cllr Charlotte Morley |
| + Cllr Paul Deach | + Cllr Adrian Page |
| + Cllr Tim Dodds | + Cllr Ken Pedder |
| - Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr Chris Pitt |
| + Cllr Craig Fennell | + Cllr Wynne Price |
| + Cllr Surinder Gandhum | + Cllr Audrey Roxburgh |
| + Cllr Heather Gerred | + Cllr Ian Sams |
| + Cllr Liane Gibson | + Cllr Pat Tedder |
| + Cllr Moira Gibson | + Cllr Judi Trow |
| + Cllr Alastair Graham | + Cllr Valerie White |
| + Cllr David Hamilton | - Cllr Alan Whittart |
| - Cllr Beverley Harding | + Cllr John Winterton |

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

24/C Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors David Allen, Colin Dougan, Beverley Harding, Paul Ilnicki, Lexie Kemp and Alan Whittart.

25/C Report of the Returning Officer

The Council received the report of the Returning Officer in relation to results of the by election of a councillor for the Old Dean Ward of the Borough of Surrey Heath held on 4 September 2014 and noted that Heather Gerred had been elected.

26/C Minutes

It was moved by the Mayor, seconded by the Deputy Mayor, and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 16 July 2014 be approved as a correct record.

27/C Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor announced that he had had a busy few months. He had visited a number of schools, churches and charity events. He paid particular thanks to Karen Whelan and all Council staff involved in the event for the start of the 7th Stage of the Tour of Britain.

28/C Leader's Announcements

The Leader reiterated the Mayor's expression of gratitude to council staff in relation to the Tour of Britain Event.

The Leader reported that she had attended meetings of the Joint Leader's Board (JLB) of Enterprise M3 and Enterprise M3 Board itself. The JLB had concerns about the Regeneris Housing Report which been written on behalf of Enterprise M3. The report had used 3 different models, all of which showed significant increases in housing provision over and above most adopted and pending Core Strategies. The JLB had persuaded the Board that, in order for the report to be noted, a preface would be required indicating that this was only one of the evidenced based models which could be used to determine housing numbers.

For the second tranche of growth bids, the Board was seeking to put forward as many evidence based funding bids as possible. It was considered that Surrey County Council needed to be more pro-active in Enterprise M3 in order to ensure that Surrey received its fair share of funding.

The Leader informed the Council that there were a number of councils which had failed in their duty to cooperate and were having to defer their Core Strategies. Work in Surrey, and at the JLB was being done to clearly define the requirements of the duty to cooperate and to achieve a consistent idea of what the duty actually meant. This would be important for the Council when it came to review of the Core Strategy.

29/C Declarations of Interest

In respect of Item 10(a) – Minute 36/E – House Rules, Councillor Rodney Bates stated that as a family member was employed by the Council, he would leave the room if the matter was discussed.

30/C Political Proportionality and Appointment to Committees

Resolved that

- (a) the political proportionality of the Council and allocation of seats be as set out at Annex A to these minutes; and**
- (b) the Opposition Group's appointments to Committees as nominated by the Opposition Group Leader be as set out at Annex B to these minutes.**

31/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies

- (a) Executive – 22 July, 9 September, 30 September (recommendations only)

It was moved by Councillor Moira Gibson, seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks, and

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 22 July and 9 September 2014 be received and the recommendations therein, together with the recommendations made at the meeting on 30 September, be adopted as set out below:

- 36/E House Rules

Resolved, that

- (i) the Council's House Rules be adopted; and**
- (ii) the House Rules be removed from Staff Terms and Conditions**

- 51/E Treasury Management Strategy Update 2014/15

Resolved to adopt the Revised Treasury Management Strategy for 2014/15 including the changes to investment criteria and limits shown at Annex A to the agenda report.

- 52/E Review of the Corporate Capital Programme 2013/14 and Report Capital Prudential Indicators for 2013/14

Resolved that

- (i) the carry forward budget provision of £3.635 million from 2013/14 into 2014/15 be approved;**
- (ii) the revised 2014/15 Capital Programme of £4.693 million be noted; and**
- (iii) the final capital prudential indicators for 2013/14 be noted.**

- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 30 July, 26 August and 22 September 2014

It was moved by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Valerie White, and

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Applications Committee held on 30 July, 26 August and 22 September 2014 be received.

- (c) Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee - Audit meeting - 23 July 2014 and Scrutiny meetings - 23 July and 24 September 2014

It was moved by Councillor John May, seconded by Councillor Tom Dodds, that subject to an amendment to the minutes of the meeting held on 24 September to show that Councillor Liane Gibson was a substitute for Councillor Beverley Harding, the minutes of the meetings of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee Audit meeting held on 23 July 2014 and the Scrutiny meetings held on 23 July and 24 September 2014 be received.

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee Audit meeting held on 23 July 2014 and the Scrutiny meetings held on 23 July and 24 September 2014 (as amended) be received.

- (d) Licensing Committee – 3 September 2014

It was moved by Councillor Bill Chapman, seconded by Councillor Ian Sams and

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 3 September 2014 be received.

- (e) External Partnerships Select Committee – 16 September 2014

It was moved by Councillor Josephine Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Paul Deach and

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 16 September 2014 be received.

- (f) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 18 September 2014

It was moved by Councillor Ken Pedder, seconded by Councillor Audrey Roxburgh and

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 18 September 2014 be received.

32/C Portfolio Holder's Question Time

Councillor Charlotte Morley, the Corporate Portfolio answered questions regarding her areas of responsibility, in particular in relation to political engagement for 16 to 17 year olds, the Council's new Website and the forthcoming trial of paperless meetings.

33/C Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the ground that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act as set out below:

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
34/C	3
35/C	3

The following are summaries of matters contained in Part II of the agenda, the minutes of which it is considered should remain confidential at the present time.

34/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies - Exempt

The Council approved the exempt minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2014. It also received the exempt minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 9 September and made decisions relating to exempt recommendations made by the Executive at its meeting on 9 and 30 September 2014

35/C Review of Exempt Items

The Council reviewed the minutes and decision which had been considered at the meeting following the exclusion of members of the press and public, as they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information.

Resolved that

- (i) minute 22/C - Frimley Lodge Park 3G Pitch - to remain exempt until after the completion of the negotiations but a press release be issued; and**
- (ii) the minutes relating to the following to remain exempt until completion of the negotiations**

43/E - Depot Warehouse, Doman Road, Camberley

44/E - Retail Premises at 25 Princess Way, Camberley

45/E - Retail Premises, 179a London Road, Camberley

46/E - Car Wash at Main Square Multi Storey Car Park, Camberley

47/E - Land at Wilton Road, Camberley

54/E - Acquisition of 29c High Street, Camberley

Mayor

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 30
September 2014**

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)
+ Cllr Richard Brooks (Vice Chairman)

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| + Cllr Keith Bush | + Cllr Craig Fennell |
| + Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Charlotte Morley |
| - Cllr Colin Dougan | |
- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

49/E Minutes

The non-exempt and exempt minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 9 September 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

50/E Community Fund Grant Applications

The Council's Community Fund Grant Scheme provided grants of up to £25,000 to assist local 'not for profit organisations' with the delivery of community projects. Total project costs of up to £2,000 could attract 75% match funding and total project costs over £2,001 could attract 50% match funding.

The Executive considered three applications for grants which met the Scheme's criteria. Other applications had been submitted, three of which had been incomplete and three had not met the criteria.

Members discussed the application from Sight for Surrey, which would provide for the purchase of an initial stock of 500 i-passports for the Surrey Heath Area, and recognised that it was a worthwhile project. The total project would cost £396. It was therefore agreed to make an exception and fund the entire project cost.

The Executive noted that the application from Camberley Rugby Club had been recommended for deferral as the future of Watchetts Recreation Ground was currently under consideration by the Council and it was felt that any decision on the grant award should be made at a later date, in the context of a wider plan for the site.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the following grants be awarded from the Council's Community Fund Grant Scheme:**
- a. £396 be awarded to Sight for Surrey (formerly SAVI) for the purchase of an initial stock for 500 i-passports;**
 - b. £3,900 be awarded to Voluntary Support to purchase a new software and training package, with the suggestion that**

VSNS apply for funding from Runnymede Borough Council to contribute towards this project; and

- (ii) the decision relating to the application from Camberley Rugby Club's application for a grant to part-fund the extension of its Club House be deferred.**

51/E Treasury Management Strategy Update 2014/15

The Executive considered a report proposing changes to the Council's Treasury Management Strategy, which were expected to generate extra income from the Council's investments. That year the Council had budgeted to receive £185,000 from its investments; however, the Council's Treasury Advisers believed there was scope for improvement.

It was noted that Treasury income had fallen sharply since 2007/08 due to the expiry of longer term investments placed several years before, the banking crisis and the ongoing policy of very low interest rates, and low demand for investment.

The Executive was advised that it was therefore proposed that the Council diversify its investments into other areas that should provide better returns. This included investing in property funds, corporate bond funds and investments in supra national banks. The Council's Treasury Advisers had estimated that over several years, the rate of return on the proposed alternatives would average at least 4.0%, noting that returns would be higher in some years and lower in others. It was estimated that an additional £35,000 income could be generated, for every £1m identified for any such long-term investment.

RECOMMENDED that the Revised Treasury Management Strategy for 2014/15 including the changes to investment criteria and limits shown at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted.

52/E Review of the Corporate Capital Programme 2013/14 and Report Capital Prudential Indicators for 2013/14

The Executive considered a report on the capital outturn for 2013/14 and the approval of any carry forward of budgets into the 2014/15 Capital Programme, and a report on the actual performance against the 2013/14 capital prudential indicators.

It was noted that a number of the carry forward capital schemes were due to the timings of the works, which were either ongoing or works which had been completed after the 2013/14 financial year end.

RECOMMENDED that

- (i) the carry forward budget provision of £3.635 million from 2013/14 into 2014/15 be approved;**

- (ii) the revised 2014/15 Capital Programme of £4.693 million be noted; and**

(iii) the final capital prudential indicators for 2013/14 be noted.

53/E Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the ground that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as set out below:

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Paragraph(s)</u>
49/E(part)	3
54/E	3
55/E	3

The following are summaries of matters considered in Part II of the agenda, the minutes of which it is considered should remain confidential at the present time.

54/E Acquisition of 29c High Street, Camberley

The Executive made decisions relating to the acquisition of interest in land and buildings at 29c High Street, Camberley.

55/E Review of Exempt Items

The Executive reviewed the report which had been considered at the meeting following the exclusion of members of the press and public, as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information.

Resolved that the decision at minute 55/E be made public but the minute and report remain exempt until completion of the negotiations.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 21
October 2014**

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

- Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Colin Dougan
+ Cllr Keith Bush	+ Cllr Craig Fennell
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Charlotte Morley

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Chris Pitt

56/E Minutes

The non-exempt and exempt minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 30 September 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

57/E Deepcut Neighbourhood Forum/Neighbourhood Plan Area Applications

The Executive considered applications for the creation of a Neighbourhood Forum and the designation of a Neighbourhood Area in Deepcut. The applications had been the subject of a six week consultation, which had ended on 24 July 2014.

Members were advised that the Neighbourhood Forum application met the requirements set out in Schedule 9 part 1 of the Localism Act 2011 and the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

A Plan showing the proposed Neighbourhood Area and an accompanying statement had been submitted by the proposed Neighbourhood Forum. The statement set out the applicants' view that the Neighbourhood Area should not include the Princess Royal Barracks as the site was identified in the Council's adopted Core Strategy and had an adopted Supplementary Planning Document to guide development of the site. An outline planning consent had also been granted on that site.

The Executive was informed that, for a Neighbourhood Plan to be adopted, it would have to be subject to a public examination by an Inspector and, following that, a referendum, with costs estimated to amount to over £30,000; the Local Planning Authority was legally obliged to fund the costs of the examination and referendum.

The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) was offering funding of £5,000 to Local Planning Authorities following designation of a Neighbourhood Area. The next round of applications for the funding would commence on 1 December 2014. A further grant from DCLG of £25,000 was available for Plans which had passed the examination stage; however, this was only guaranteed for applications made in 2014/2015. A Deepcut Neighbourhood

Plan was unlikely to meet this deadline and it was therefore uncertain whether the £25,000 funding would be forthcoming for 2015/2016.

The Executive agreed that, although verbal confirmation had been received that the membership of the Forum complied with the requirements of the Act, the decision would be subject to the satisfactory receipt of written confirmation detailing the Forum membership's inclusion of local residents, businesses and elected representatives.

RESOLVED that

- (i) subject to the receipt of a satisfactory letter confirming the make-up of the Neighbourhood Forum membership:**
 - a. the Neighbourhood Forum be formally designated as the Deepcut Neighbourhood Forum;**
 - b. the Neighbourhood Area within the red line in the map attached to the agenda report, excluding those areas within the blue lines on the amended Neighbourhood Area map, be designated for the purposes of a Deepcut Neighbourhood Plan;**
 - c. upon receipt of the £5,000 grant, authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory Services, after consultation with the Regulatory Portfolio Holder, to use the funds to support officer and other costs to the Council; and**
- (ii) if Central Government Funding is not forthcoming in future years, then a report be taken to the Executive.**

58/E Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers

The Executive received a report on a review of the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers in relation to executive functions.

RESOLVED to defer the matter and refer it to the Governance Working Group for consideration.

59/E Annual Pay Settlement Procedure

The Joint Staff Consultative Group, at its meeting on 18 September 2014, had considered a revised Annual Pay Settlement Procedure. The new procedure had been revised to reflect a procedure which was more efficient and practical.

RECOMMENDED that the Council's revised Annual Pay Settlement Procedure, as attached at Annex A to these minutes, be adopted.

60/E Information Security Policy

The Joint Staff Consultative Group, at its meeting on 18 September 2014, had considered revisions to the Information Security Policy. It was reported that changes imposed upon Local Authorities by the Cabinet Office had required the Council to review the policy in order to tighten up certain controls and impose further network access restrictions.

RECOMMENDED that the amendments to the Information Security Policy, as set out at Annex B to these minutes, be approved and the recommendations and procedure therein be adopted.

61/E Data Security Breach Management Policy and Procedure

The Joint Staff Consultative Group, at its meeting on 18 September 2014, had considered the introduction of a Data Security Breach Management Policy and Procedure. The Policy and Procedure contained the correct procedures for managing any compromise of information, data, information systems, or physical buildings at any time. It also demonstrated the Council's commitment to Information Management.

The Executive considered the document. It was agreed to amend paragraph 8.1 of the Policy to state that, in addition to reviewing the Policy after a serious breach or any following any legislative changes, a policy review would be conducted annually.

RECOMMENDED to Council that the Data Security Breach Management Policy and Procedure, as amended and as set out at Annex C to these minutes, be approved and adopted.

62/E Flexible Working Policy and Procedure

The Joint Staff Consultative Group, at its meeting on 18 September 2014, had considered a revised Flexible Working Policy & Procedure.

The procedure had been revised to reflect the changes introduced in June 2014 which gave all employees the statutory right to request flexible working after 26 weeks employment service. The policy offered guidance for reviewing and implementing flexible working arrangements.

RECOMMENDED that the Council's revised Flexible Working Policy & Procedure, as attached at Annex D to these minutes, be adopted.

63/E Off-site Working Policy & Procedure

The Joint Staff Consultative Group, at its meeting on 18 September 2014, had considered the adoption of an Off-site Working Policy and Procedure. The document set out the policy and procedures for implementing and reviewing arrangements for staff who regularly spent a proportion of their contracted working hours off-site.

The application of the policy was primarily to set a framework for assessment and review of working arrangements designed to be of benefit to the operation of Council services. However, it could also benefit individuals indirectly through permitting flexibility of working arrangements that also enhanced service delivery.

The policy did not apply to incidences of irregular, ad-hoc off-site working or flexible working arrangements.

RECOMMENDED that the Council's Off-site Working Policy & Procedure, as attached at Annex E to these minutes, be adopted.

64/E Vote of Thanks

The Leader, on behalf of the Council, expressed her thanks to the museum volunteer who had cleaned and polished the Council Chamber clock.

Chairman

Annual Pay Settlement Procedure

Authorisation

The Head of Paid Service for Surrey Heath Borough Council will authorise the annual pay settlement and inform Full Council as part of the budget setting process.

Definition

This procedure is to determine the value of the annual pay settlement that will be paid to all staff when determined on/or backdated to 1st April each year.

A pay settlement will be determined for the year running from 1st April until 31st March.

Procedure

As part of annual budget setting, consideration will be given to the Annual Pay Settlement.

In relation to the annual pay settlement the considerations will include (but not be limited to) the following:

- Results of benchmarking:
 - to ensure the Council is able to recruit and retain appropriately experienced and qualified employees; that it remains competitive and an employer of choice within Surrey
 - to be undertaken as and when required.
 - local and South East regional data (both public and private sector) accessed from a variety of sources as agreed by Management and Staff representatives
- Recruitment and retention trends – e.g. turnover and identification of skill types or service areas where recruitment is difficult.
- The nature and level of other benefits (i.e. non-salary) provided to staff.
- The level of the Living Wage.
- The wider economic environment and affordability, in the context of service delivery and staff recruitment and retention matters.

There will be 3 meetings held to determine the final proposal for the Annual Pay Settlement:

1. Management Board will inform Staff Representatives of the proposed annual pay settlement. Staff Representatives will assess the offer by canvassing staff and gathering their own data.
2. Staff Representatives can feedback on proposals and put forward counter proposals for consideration.
3. Management Board will confirm with staff representatives the Annual Pay Settlement to be put forward as part of the Council's budget.

Timeline

In November of each year at Star Chamber, consideration will be given to the Annual Pay Settlement.

In January meetings to take place between Management Board and Staff Representatives.

At Full Council in February the budget including the proposed pay settlement will be put forward for agreement.

If the pay settlement is not agreed as part of the budget setting at Full Council in February, it should be noted that this could delay the payment of any agreed pay settlement as Full Council does not meet again until April.

ANNUAL REVIEW OF Information Security Policy V10 DRAFT AWAITING APPROVAL

1. Introduction amended paragraph addition in red requested by Geraldine

This ICT Security Policy forms part of Surrey Heath Borough Council's Information Governance Strategy and provides a 'Code of Practice' for all users of the Council's computer systems and is contained within the 'Staff Terms and Conditions' as does the Group Policy Security statement which is accepted by clicking on OK when logging onto the network each time.

Also removed reference to

- Government Connect GSi Code of Connection Version 4.1

Replaced with

- Public Sector Network Code of Connect

2. Addition to 7.5 Equipment Installation

Equipment must always be purchased, tagged and installed by, or with the permission of the ICT team. Under no circumstances should ICT equipment be relocated by non ICT staff. If a user requires equipment to be moved it should be pre-arranged by logging a call with the ICT Helpdesk

3. Internet use

Removed

All internet access is monitored and reported to each Head of Service on a monthly basis. It is not possible to provide such reporting to Service Heads. Internet logs are extremely large and complex to interpret.

4. 12.1 Wireless network access point

Removed

This network is not available for personal use and access permission can only be granted by the ICT Manager.

This facility is available for work related and personal use and poses no risk to the corporate network

5. 13 Government Connect.

Now titled Public Sector Network Connection

13 rewritten to reflect new Public Sector code of connection requirements

6. 4.3 Personal and third party equipment

Remote access is an acceptable use of non Surrey Heath equipment

Due to PSN code of connection changes, amended to

Remote access is only acceptable with non Surrey Heath equipment for ICT support contractors and staff email. A Surrey Heath managed device must be used for remote access other than non GCSX email. In exceptional emergency circumstances authorised by the ICT Manager or Executive Head of Transformation, this restriction may be lifted to enable remote access from a non-Surrey Heath managed device.

7. 5.2 New Accounts

Added Human Resources due to PSN changes

New account requests must be authorised by the **Human Resources Team** and line manager of the new member of staff.

5.9 Officers responsible for information security

Removed reference to Oracle Financials.#

10.3 Removed paragraph

Access to the solution can be made from home computers, however the following conditions apply:

- The minimum operating system should be Windows XP SP3 which must be fully patched; this however can be deviated with approval from ICT Services.
- A valid up-to-date copy of Anti-Virus software must be installed and running and under no circumstances be disabled.

As bring your own device BYOD will no longer be relevant

DATA SECURITY BREACH MANAGEMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURE

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC) processes personal data and must respond appropriately against unauthorised or unlawful processing, against loss, destruction of or damage to data.
- 1.2 Under the Data Protection Act 1998, Surrey Heath Borough Council is a Data Controller. This is a “person” who determines the purposes for which and the manner in which any personal data are, or are not to be processed. The seventh Data Protection principle states that organisations, which process personal data, must take “appropriate technical and organisational measures against unauthorised or unlawful processing of personal data and against accidental loss or destruction of, or damage to, personal data”. This means SHBC has a responsibility to ensure appropriate security of all personal data it holds.

The Data Protection Act 1998 says **personal data** concerns the identification of living individuals. Information, described as Sensitive Personal Information, must have extra care taken. The definition of Sensitive Personal Information is:

- racial or ethnic origin of the data subject
 - political opinions
 - religious beliefs or other beliefs of a similar nature
 - membership of a trade union
 - physical or mental health or condition
 - sexual life
 - the commission or alleged commission by him/her of an offence or any proceedings for any offence committed or alleged to have been committed
 - the disposal of such proceeding or the sentence of any court in the proceedings.
- 1.3 As well as defining SHBC’s policy, this procedure lays out the actions, which should be taken once a breach has occurred.

2. SCOPE

- 2.1 This policy and procedure applies to all users of SHBC’s information, data, information systems and the Council’s physical buildings. It applies to not only staff and members but also contractors, agency staff, service providers, consultants and anyone else engaged to work in the organisation and encompasses data, information, software, systems, and paper documents.
- 2.2 This policy should be read in conjunction with other relevant policies, including but not limited to:
- Information Governance Strategy and Policy
 - Data Protection Policy

- Information Security Policy
- Email Management Policy
- Disciplinary Policy
- Social Media Policy
- Whistle-blowing Policy and Procedure

All staff, including all new starters, must read and sign that they have read this policy as this forms part of the Staff Terms and Conditions.

3. **TYPES OF BREACH**

3.1 A number of factors could cause data protection breaches. The following is a list of examples but it is not exhaustive and there may be others which will need to be considered at the time of the breach:

- loss or theft of data
- loss or theft of equipment on which data is stored
- inappropriate access controls allowing unauthorised use, both electronic and paper
- equipment failure
- human error in dealing with personal information including both electronic and paper
- unforeseen circumstances such as fire or flood
- hacking attack on the Council's ICT systems
- 'Blagging' offences where information is obtained by deceiving the organisation who holds it
- unauthorised access into secure areas

4. **NOTIFICATION OF BREACHES**

4.1 The person who discovers/receives a report of a breach must inform the Information Governance Manager forthwith. If the breach is discovered due to whistle blowing and the reporter does not wish to tell the Information Governance Manager then an/the appropriate manager must tell the Information Governance Manager. In the absence of the Information Governance Manager then the Monitoring Officer (Head of Legal) should be informed. If the breach occurs, or is discovered outside normal working hours, notification must happen as soon as is practicable.

4.2 The Information Governance Manager or in their absence the Monitoring Officer, will then decide whether to involve other departments e.g. Human Resources, ICT.

4.3 The Information Governance Manager will maintain a log with the details of all breaches. This will include who the Lead Investigator is, when the breach occurred, who is involved and what action must be taken after the breach.

4.4 The Information Governance Manager will, in consultation with others, if necessary, decide who the Lead Investigator should be, who needs to be involved and will work with them to manage the breach. The Information Governance Manager is responsible for advising services on assessing the impact of any data breach of the Data Protection Act. This can include recommendations to restore data security.

- 4.5 The Lead Investigator could be any of the following:
- a member of Audit and Investigations
 - Executive Head
 - Monitoring Officer
 - Information Governance Manager
 - a member of Human Resources
 - a combination of the above
- 4.6 The Information Governance Manager or Monitoring Officer will decide whom to notify.
- 4.7 If the breach involves any IT systems, the ICT Manager (or in the manager's absence ICT Systems Team) must be informed immediately.
- 4.8 The Senior Information Risk Owner (SIRO) (the Executive Head of Finance) will be told of any breaches at the Information Governance Managers regular review meetings. For serious breaches (i.e. the extent of the 'damage'), the SIRO must be informed immediately, the Chief Executive will be made aware. A decision will be taken as to whether to inform the Information Commissioner's Office. The final decision on notifying the Information Commissioner's Office rests with the SIRO. The process will consider the number of people affected and/or the seriousness of the consequences.
- 4.9 The Lead Investigator/SIRO must also consider whether the police need to be informed. This could be appropriate where illegal activity is known or is believed to have occurred, or where there is a risk that illegal activity might occur in the future. If credit card numbers are lost then tell the appropriate bankcard provider.
- 4.10 Consider notifying all staff if thought necessary or will stop additional breaches.
- 4.11 Notification should have a clear purpose. This can be to gather information, advice or allow the appropriate regulatory bodies to perform their functions, and deal with complaints. It can also enable individuals affected to take steps to protect themselves.
- 4.12 Answering the following questions will assist you in deciding whether to notify people and who:
- can notification help you meet your security obligations with regard to the seventh Data Protection principle? See 1.2
 - can notification help the individual? Bearing in mind the potential effects of the breach, could individuals act on the information you provide to mitigate risks, for example by cancelling a credit card or changing a password?
 - consider how notification can be made appropriate for particular groups of individuals, for example, if children or vulnerable adults are involved. Also, consider the appropriate method of communication. Always bear in mind the security of the medium as well as the urgency of the situation.
 - consider the danger of 'over notifying'. Not every incident will warrant notification and notifying the whole customer base of an issue affecting only a few customers may well cause disproportionate enquiries, upset and work. It may also cause unwarranted release of data (secondary breach).

- as well as notifying the Information Commissioner's Office, other regulatory bodies may need to be informed.

-

5. CONTAINMENT

- 5.1 At the same time as notification is happening, containment and recovery must also happen.
- 5.2 The Lead Investigator must ascertain whether the breach is still occurring. If so, it must be stopped immediately and minimise the effect of the breach. This will involve liaison with appropriate staff. Examples might be the ICT Manager authorising the shut down of a computer system or stopping the delivery of mail.
- 5.3 Media and Marketing may need telling of a breach if there is a possibility of information published on the Internet or the press told and their assistance is required in managing a media response.

6. ASSESSING THE RISKS

- 6.1 Some data security breaches will not lead to risks beyond the possible inconvenience to those who use the data to do their job, for example if a laptop is irreparably damaged or lost, in line with the Information Security Policy, it is encrypted, and no data is stored on the device. There will be a monetary cost to the Council by the loss of the device but not a security breach.
- 6.2 Whilst these types of incidents can still have significant consequences, the risks are very different from those posed by, for example, the theft of customer data, whereby the data may be used to commit identity fraud.
- 6.3 Before deciding on what steps are necessary, and after immediate containment, an assessment of the risks, which may be associated with the breach, must take place. One of the key assessments is the potential adverse consequences for individuals, how serious or substantial these are and how likely they are to happen. A key part of the definition of a breach is harm and distress i.e. what harm and distress will the breach cause; in particular to the individuals concerned but could include the Council.
- 6.4 Although there is no definition of a 'serious breach' a decision will have to be made as to whether a breach is 'serious'. The following should be considered in making the decision before reporting:
- has harm or distress been caused to data subjects – for example identity theft through loss of details on a passport
 - volume of data lost – for example unencrypted laptop with lots of individuals personal details
 - loss of sensitive data for example a manual file with medical, criminal and details of a vulnerable child or an individual
- 6.5 As part of the risk, consider whether the person/people whose information has been breached should be informed. The guidance from the Information Commissioner is that they should be informed unless to inform them will cause additional distress/stress.

6.6 If after conducting a risk assessment on whether to notify the people whose data has been compromised and it is considered appropriate to contact them, consider the following:

- what is the most appropriate method of communication? Always bear in mind the security of the medium as well as the urgency of the situation
- the notification should include as a minimum, a description of how and when the breach occurred and what data was involved. Include details of what has already been done to respond to the risks posed by the breach
- give the individuals clear advice on what they should do to protect themselves and what the Council are willing to do on their behalf
- provide a means of contacting SHBC for further information. This could include a named individual, a helpline number, a web page or a combination of all of these.

6.7 Helpful tips for assessment of risks:

- what type of data is involved?
- how sensitive is it? Is it sensitive personal details as defined by the Data Protection Act 1998 (e.g. housing benefits) or other data types which are sensitive because of what might happen if it is misused (e.g. bank account details). See 1.2 for a definition of sensitive personal information
- if data has been lost or stolen, are there any protections in place such as encryption?
- what has happened to the data?
- can the data be restored or recreated?
- how usable is the lost data?
- if data has been stolen, could it be used for purposes which are harmful to the individuals to whom the data relates; if it has been damaged, this poses a different type and level of risk
- what could the data tell a third party about the individual? Sensitive data could mean very little to an opportunistic laptop thief while the loss of apparently trivial snippets of information could help a determined fraudster build up a detailed picture of other people
- how many individuals' personal data is affected by the breach? It is not necessarily the case that the bigger risks will accrue from the loss of large amounts of data but is certainly an important determining factor in the overall risk assessment
- who are the individuals whose data has been breached? Are they staff, customers, clients or suppliers?
- what harm can come to those individuals because of the breach? Are there risks to physical safety or reputation, financial loss, fraudulent use or a combination of these and other aspects of their life?
- are there wider consequences to consider such as a risk to loss of public confidence in one of the service areas?
- if an individual's bank details have been lost, consider contacting the banks themselves for advice on anything they can do to help prevent fraudulent use

7. INVESTIGATION, EVALUATION AND RESPONSE

- 7.1 In most cases, the next stage would be for the Lead Investigator to fully investigate the breach. The Lead Investigator should ascertain whose data was involved in the breach, the person or people responsible for the breach, the potential effect on the data subject and what further steps need to be taken to remedy the situation.
- 7.2 Breaches will require not just an initial investigation, decision on the severity and containment of the situation but also a recovery plan including, where necessary damage limitation. This will often involve input from ICT, HR, Legal, Information Governance and the appropriate department. In some cases contact with external stakeholders or suppliers may be required.
- 7.3 The Information Governance Manager will assist the Lead Investigator, where necessary. This could include informing the Information Commissioner's Office, calculating the severity of the incident, collating reports, implementing actions from the Information Governance report.
- 7.4 The Lead Investigator will establish the questions for interviews and then meet with the participants. This could be (but is not limited to or necessarily all of them) witnesses, victims and perpetrators, senior managers.
- 7.5 The Lead Investigator will identify if there is a need for expert advice from either professional advisers or Legal Services.
- 7.6 Issues to be addressed during the investigation will include:
- the date when the breach occurred
 - the date when the breach was identified to SHBC and to whom
 - the type of data and the number of records involved
 - its sensitivity
 - the circumstances of the release
 - what protection is in place (for example encryption)
 - what has happened to the data
 - whether the data could be put to any illegal or inappropriate use
 - how many people are affected
 - what group of people has been affected (the public, suppliers etc)
 - whether there are wider consequences of the breach
- 7.7 The lead investigator will keep an electronic record of all activities during the investigation. This could include the actions taken to mitigate the breach and lessons learnt. The reason for this is if there are actions by the police, Information Commissioner's Office, legal proceedings or Audit, the records will be required to be shared.
- 7.8 There could be a number of investigations going on at any one time for example by Human Resources and ICT.
- 7.9 Begin investigation immediately on receipt of notification. Complete urgently and wherever possible within 24 hours of the breach being discovered/reported. Carry out, if necessary a further review of the causes of the breach and recommendations for future improvements once the matter has been resolved
- 7.10 If systemic or on-going problems are identified, draw up an action plan to correct. If the breach warrants a disciplinary investigation (for example due to

negligence), the Lead Investigator should pass on any relevant information to Human Resources

7.11 The Lead Investigator should produce a report for the SIRO.

7.12 The report must address the following:

- establish the facts (including those that may be disputed)
- include a chronology of events including the containment, recovery and how the breach has been investigated
- a risk analysis
- a commentary of the weight of evidence
- action to minimise/mitigate effect on individuals involved including whether the victims have been informed
- whether any other regulatory body and been informed and their response
- recommendations to reduce the chance of the same breach happening again

8. **REVIEW**

8.1 A policy review will take place annually or after a serious breach, legislative changes, important changes in case law, or guidance.

This page is intentionally left blank

Flexible Working Policy & Procedures

1 Introduction

From 30 June 2014 every Council employee has the statutory right to request flexible working after 26 weeks employment service.

This policy offers guidance regarding the Council's policy and procedures for reviewing and implementing flexible working arrangements for statutory requests under provision of the Employment Rights Act 2006.

This policy and procedure does not automatically apply for non-statutory requests for flexible working arrangements, but managers are encouraged to apply similar principles of fairness and transparency when reviewing such non-statutory requests.

2 Scope

This policy and its procedures will be applied where an eligible member of staff wishes to make an application. Any staff member employed directly by the Council has the statutory right to apply for flexible working after 26 weeks continuous service.

4 Policy Statement

Surrey Heath Borough Council recognises the need to develop effective flexible working practices in order to assist staff to maintain a good work-life balance whilst preventing detriment to the services delivered to the local community.

5 Equality Assessment

Surrey Heath Borough Council promotes an adaptive and flexible approach to working for staff in all jobs and grades. Flexible working employees are entitled to the same opportunities for career development and training as office-based employees.

The Council promotes objectivity and fairness in its approach to reviewing flexible working requests. Employees requesting flexible working should not be treated unfairly or unfavourably following the request, regardless of the outcome.

This Policy, procedures and related guidelines has been Impact Assessed by the Equality Acton Group

6 Principle and Aims

- 6.1 This policy and its procedures have been devised in line with the requirements of the Employment Rights Act 2006.

- 6.2 It aims to outline employee statutory rights relating to flexible working requests and explains each stage of the procedure.
- 6.3 By following a set policy and procedure, flexible working requests will be handled in a consistent manner by managers, therefore ensuring fairness and transparency throughout the process.

7 Eligibility

- 7.1 All staff members employed directly by the Council have the statutory right to apply for flexible working after 26 weeks continuous service.
- 7.2 Other staff groups (e.g. those employed for less than 26 weeks, agency workers or volunteers) do not have a statutory right to apply but may still discuss the possibility of flexible working with their line manager if the arrangement may be beneficial for the service.
- 7.3 However, it should be noted that not all job roles are suitable for implementation of flexible working arrangements. Surrey Heath Borough Council will seriously consider any statutory application made and it will only be refused if there is a good business reason(s) for doing so. Whilst eligible employees have the right to apply for flexible working this may not be agreed to if to do so would impair Service provision.
- 7.4 Any change agreed will be deemed a permanent change to your Terms and Conditions of employment, unless a trial or temporary period is agreed.
- 7.5 Any eligible employee can make one statutory request for flexible working during a 12 month period.
- 7.6 Although an eligible employee may make subsequent requests within a 12 month period, these would not be regarded as a statutory right to request change to contractual terms as detailed by the Employment Rights Act 2006 and therefore review of the application would be subject to management discretion.
- 7.7 Within their statutory flexible working request eligible employees can request a change to;
- the hours he/she is required to work;
 - the times he/she is required to work;
 - where he/she is required to work (home or and employer's place of business).

8 Procedure (Statutory Requests)

8.1 Application

For consistency and fairness of procedure, all flexible working requests should be in writing, using the Council's Flexible Working Application Form (available via e scene or from HR) and must be fully completed.

- 8.2 When requesting flexible working under the statutory scheme, you must include the following information in your application:
- The date of the application
 - The change to work conditions that you are seeking
 - The date that you would like the conditions to come into effect
 - The effect that you anticipate the requested change will have on the Council and how such effects may be managed.
 - That this is a statutory request (you will need to declare that you have not made another statutory request for change to contractual terms and conditions within the last 12 months).

8.3 If you are requesting a temporary flexible working arrangement in response to particular personal or operational circumstances, you should identify this in your application as flexible working arrangements are otherwise considered a permanent change to your terms and conditions.

8.4 **Manager Review**

Line managers have the responsibility of managing their staff on a day to day basis but the Executive Head/Head of Service will also need to be consulted in relation to any application for flexible working.

8.5 **Consultation**

After receipt of your application, your line manager will meet with you within 14 calendar days at a mutually agreed time and date, to discuss your statutory request.

8.6 If you wish, you are permitted to bring a colleague, Staff or Trade Union representative to the meeting; they can talk with you and address the meeting, but they cannot answer any questions on your behalf.

8.7 If the colleague or representative cannot attend the scheduled meeting, then it will be re-scheduled to take place within 7 days of the original date.

8.8 In the event you cannot attend the scheduled meeting, you should contact your Line Manager as soon as possible in order to reschedule the meeting.

9 **Outcome**

9.1 The Council will inform you of its decision in writing within 14 calendar days of the meeting. The Council reserves the right to extend this time limit, provided it is mutually agreed with the employee.

9.2 The Council reserves the right to provisionally accept flexible working requests with modifications.

9.3 **Success**

If the request for flexible working is agreed, the Council will include the following in a dated, written notification:

- A description of the new working pattern

- The date from which it will take effect.
- An end or review date of the working pattern (if temporary)
- Any other conditions relating to the arrangement.

9.4 Please bear in mind that it can take up to 14 weeks to implement any approved flexible working requests.

9.5 If successfully implemented, your application for flexible working will be permanent, unless a trial period or end date has otherwise been agreed with your Line Manager and Executive Head/Head of Service.

9.6 **Rejection**

The Council is not obliged to approve a request for changes to working arrangements, but is required to consider a valid request seriously.

9.7 Rejection of statutory flexible working request is legally permissible only where one of the following eight criteria applies:

- Burden of additional costs
- Detrimental effect on the ability to meet customer service demands
- Inability to re-organise work amongst existing employees
- Inability to recruit additional employees
- Detrimental impact on quality
- Detrimental impact on performance
- Insufficiency of work during the periods the employee wishes to work
- Planned structural changes

9.8 If your statutory flexible working request is refused, the Council will provide a written, dated explanation, identifying one of the eight categories above.

10 **Appeal Procedure**

10.1 Executive Head/Heads of Service (or an appropriate nominated representative) will consider any appeals against refusal of the flexible working request.

10.2 If you decide to appeal the decision, you must confirm this in writing to your manager.

10.3 Council representatives will meet with you within 14 calendar days of your notification of appeal. Again you may be accompanied to the meeting by a colleague, Staff or Trade Union representative.

10.4 The Council will inform you of its final decision in writing within 14 calendar days of the appeal meeting date.

11 Withdrawal of Applications

- 11.1 You may withdraw your application for flexible working anytime prior to written agreement, but it should be in writing to avoid any misunderstandings.
- 11.2 If you miss two consecutive meetings (initial or appeal) in relation to your flexible working application, then it will be considered as withdrawn and you will not be entitled to make another statutory application for 12 months.
- 11.3 The Council will confirm the withdrawal in writing.

12 Further Guidance for Managers

- 12.1 Managers have a responsibility to be aware of the Council's legal requirements with regards to statutory flexible working requests and the timeframes associated with each stage of the process.
- 12.2 Where possible, managers should endeavour to adhere to the process below:
 - 1. Applications to be **date stamped** upon receipt by manager.
 - 2. Consultation meeting to be booked within 14 calendar days of application receipt date.
 - 3. Decision to be confirmed in writing within 14 calendar days of consultation meeting.
 - 4. Appeal meeting to be booked within 14 calendar days of appeal notification.
 - 5. Decision to be confirmed in writing within 14 calendar days of appeal meeting.
- 12.3 Requests should be considered in the order that they are received.
- 12.4 If there is likely to be a delay in any stage of the process, managers should advise the applicant as soon as practicable.
- 12.5 However, the whole process (including appeal) **must** be completed within **3 months** unless the employee has formally agreed to an extension.
- 12.6 If an applicant is unable to attend a consultation meeting in person, the employee may instead be consulted via email telephone but notes must be taken about what was discussed and/or agreed.
- 12.7 In the event of receiving multiple requests, managers should discuss the applications with Human Resources where they have more than one application under review at any one time.
- 12.8 For further guidance on strategies for fair and reasonable review of flexible working requests, see ACAS guidelines or seek advice from Human Resources.
(PDF: <http://www.acas.org.uk/media/pdf/p/6/Handling-requests-to-work-flexibly-in-a-reasonable-manner-an-Acas-guide.pdf>)

This page is intentionally left blank

Off-site Working Policy and Procedure

1 Introduction

Organisations are increasingly being faced with conflicting demands to achieve greater productivity at lower cost, while remaining responsive and flexible to the working requirements of their staff and services.

Surrey Heath Borough Council recognises the need to develop more efficient working practices that serve to enhance employee performance whilst enabling them to achieve and/or maintain a good work-life balance.

The practice of off-site working offers individuals the freedom to work in an environment that is most suitable to their job role or personal circumstances, while also assisting in the realisation of organisational efficiencies.

This policy offers guidance regarding the Council's policy and procedures for implementing and reviewing working arrangements for staff that regularly spend a proportion of their contracted working hours off-site. This policy does not apply for incidences of irregular, ad-hoc off-site working or flexible working arrangements.

2 Scope

This Policy applies to all members of staff (including fixed term, agency staff and volunteers or work experience students) employed on Council business that have been granted off-site working arrangements on the basis of statutory or service need. This includes home, mobile and variable workers or contractors working in partnership with the Council.

This policy should be read in conjunction with the following policies:

- Statement of Terms & Conditions of Employment (*Individual*)
- Flexible Working Policy
- Health & Safety Information for Officers
- Information Security Policy
- Grievance Policy & Procedure

However, it should be noted that not all job roles are suitable for off-site working. Where normal duties are not conducive to being undertaken via an alternative working arrangement, the associated job roles are considered beyond the scope of this policy.

3 Policy Statement

The main purpose of the Off-site Working Policy is to provide guidelines for safe and effective working in all environments while working on behalf of

Surrey Heath Borough Council and to implement effective review procedures for managers.

4 Equality Assessment

Surrey Heath Borough Council promotes an adaptive and flexible approach to working for staff in all jobs and grades. Off-site working employees are entitled to the same opportunities for career development and training as office-based employees.

The application of the policy is primarily to set a framework for assessment and review of working arrangements designed to be of benefit to the operation of Council Services. However, it may also benefit individuals indirectly through permitting flexibility of working arrangements that also enhance Service delivery.

5 Principle and Aims

- 5.1 The direct purpose of the Off-site Working Policy is twofold:
1. To provide guidance for Council staff and managers relating to the appropriate procedure for applying for changes to existing working arrangements
- and*
2. To identify the Council's expectations of managers and all off-site working groups: home, mobile and variable workers.
- 5.2 The policy also aims to support the Council's wider aims of effective service delivery via a flexible and responsive approach to working. Construction of a basic framework that identifies types of off-site worker will help to harmonise operating procedures throughout services and facilitate provision and management of Council-provided resources.

6 Definitions

- 6.1 The Council recognises three categories of off-site worker (and associated working arrangements): **home worker**, **mobile worker** and **variable worker**. **N.B.** Occasional/ad-hoc homeworkers are not included in these categories and will need to book ICT equipment in advance for use at home.
- 6.2 The Council appreciates that roles may require an individual to undertake a variety of working arrangements and expects employees to adhere to the relevant policy guidance that applies in each working environment.
- E.g. For an employee that may be a variable worker;*
- *Mobile working conditions apply while performing site visits/training/client meetings*
 - *Home working conditions apply while working in their home office environment*

6.3 **Home worker**

Employees that spend the majority of their time working from home (and not off-site or from the office). Definition includes designated home workers and regular home workers (i.e. work from home according to a set working pattern) during their home-working shifts. Equipment may be provided by the Council dependant on their role.

6.4 **Mobile worker**

Employees required to undertake the majority of their duties at a variety of off-site locations; visiting partners, service users or carrying out work at various locations. Such individuals will not normally be allocated a desk in the office. Mobile workers may be provided with equipment by the Council in order for them to undertake their normal duties safely and efficiently.

6.5 **Variable worker**

Employees that spend the majority of their working time based at the office, but regularly require full or partial access to the Public Sector Network from multiple off-site locations in order to undertake their normal duties. This does not include ad-hoc home or off-site working.

6.6 Mobile and designated home workers will not be allocated a fixed desk in the office due to the nature of their role, but may access 'hot desk' facilities when working from the office. The relevant manager or Facilities team will advise the location of available resources. The provision of a fixed desk to variable workers will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

7 **Health & Safety**

7.1 Employers have the same obligations to ensure that off-site workers are reasonably protected from harm as apply to office-based staff. Equally, employees remain responsible for their own health and safety within their off-site or home working environment.

N.B. See The Health & Safety at Work etc Act 1974.

7.2 Workplace risk assessments should be undertaken prior to implementation of a new working arrangement and reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that the off-site working environment remains compliant with current health and safety legislation. Reviews will be undertaken by the Health & Safety Advisor in accordance with relevant legislation and guidelines.

7.3 Managers and employees have specific responsibilities with regards to health and safety legislation. These are outlined in the respective 'Roles and Responsibilities' sections below. **Please ensure that you understand your responsibilities** (if in doubt, seek advice from Human Resources).

8 **Roles and Responsibilities - Manager**

8.1 Managers **must** give all valid working arrangement change requests serious consideration and identify all practical alternatives.

- 8.2 Managers are expected to review each application to establish the extent to which the request reflects a genuine business/personal need for a change in working arrangement, taking into consideration i) the nature of job role in question, ii) the personal attributes of the employee making the request, iii) impact on the team and iv) suitability of the proposed working arrangement (i.e. timings, location, etc.).
- 8.3 Applications may be provisionally approved by managers with modifications, which must be discussed with the applicant.
- 8.4 Managers must respond to all working arrangement change applications within 14 calendar days of receipt (applications should be date stamped). If this is not practicable, the manager should contact Human Resources as soon as possible.
- 8.5 Managers are expected to conduct regular reviews of working arrangements of staff within their team, considering performance, positive/negative effect on team/service and any issues arising. If existing working arrangements do not offer continued benefit to both the employee and the service, the arrangement should be formally reviewed.
- 8.6 Ad-hoc home working arrangements should be monitored by managers in order to identify regular home working patterns as they arise. The adoption of a change to regular working pattern would necessitate a formal review of the existing working arrangement.
- 8.7 Where staff have applied for, or may be affected by a change in working arrangement, managers must engage in fair and open dialogue with employees at all stages. Guidance on the consultation process may be sought from Human Resources.
- 8.8 Managers must maintain regular contact with off-site workers in their team by phone and in person (where practicable). By remaining in frequent contact with their staff, managers will be in a better position to identify any issues arising from off-site working arrangements in addition to monitoring performance and wellbeing of the employee. In the event of potential health and safety issues, it may be appropriate for management to make a site or home visit to meet with the individual.
- 8.9 Managers must advise off-site workers of the appropriate process for notification of non-attendance or inability to undertake their duties according to the shift pattern in the event of illness, emergency etc.
- 8.10 Off-site workers must be informed regarding work-related news and issues affecting the individual and/or the team.
- 8.11 Managers must ensure that off-site working arrangements are not initiated prior to completion of an appropriate health and safety assessment (and DSE self-assessment, where appropriate) and subsequent approval by the Health & Safety Advisor.

- 8.12 If any potential risks or health and safety issues arise from the off-site working health and safety assessments then it may be necessary for a home visit from the line manager and/or Health & Safety Advisor to be arranged. For more information on the risk assessment process please contact Human Resources.
- 8.13 Managers must familiarise themselves and comply with all other relevant health & safety guidance. This may include assisting with health and safety risk assessments for designated home working employees/applicants within their team.
- 8.14 Please discuss the potential impact of proposed off-site working arrangements with the Council's Information Governance Manager before implementation. Managers must work with the employee and IT to ensure that adequate precautions are taken to maintain confidentiality of information accessed or stored in an off-site/home working environment in accordance with the Council's Information Governance Policy & Strategy, Data Protection Act 1998 and related legislation or guidelines.
- 8.15 Managers must ensure that appropriate training for off-site and home working is received by all employees that are regularly working within these environments. Please contact Human Resources (Senior Learning & Development Officer) for more information regarding suitable training courses.
- 8.16 For more information about managing off-site workers (including promoting well-being and good performance), please see ACAS guidelines on home working or seek advice from Human Resources.
(PDF: <http://www.acas.org.uk/media/pdf/o/3/Homeworking-a-guide-for-employers-and-employees.pdf>)

9. Roles and Responsibilities - Employees

- 9.1 All Council employees – regardless of their working arrangements – are required to adhere to their contractual Terms & Conditions of Employment and the Code of Conduct for Officers. However, employees must also adhere to the additional responsibilities associated with their off-site working arrangement.
- 9.2 Employees requesting home working arrangements should consider whether they have the appropriate attributes required for effective working under such conditions. It may be necessary to provide evidence or examples of how these are met to support your application. These attributes include (but are not limited to):
- Self-discipline
 - The ability to work without direct supervision
 - Good organisational skills
 - Effective time management
 - Ability to cope with potentially conflicting demands of work and family

- 9.3 Existing home workers should be aware that they do not have an automatic right to revert to office-based working. This is due to the significant costs that would have been invested to initiate home working.
- 9.4 Off-site workers must maintain an appropriate amount of contact with their line manager and colleagues. This may include regular home visits or telephone calls, the frequency of which will be established as part of the off-site working arrangement process.
- 9.5 Mobile or home workers must accept reasonable requests for visits to their home office or off-site base from their line manager or an appropriate representative of the Council for work-related purposes. Such visits may be for the purposes of:
- Delivering and collecting work
 - Encouraging open communication
 - Performance monitoring and feedback
 - Ensuring health, safety and security
 - General discussions about work-related matters
- 9.6 Off-site workers are required, on request, to attend Council sites for training purposes, performance assessment and team briefings. These meetings may occur at reasonable times outside of the employee's normal working pattern. Staff will not be reimbursed time spent on such visits as attendance is considered to constitute normal duties for Council staff.
- 9.7 Employees must undertake to take appropriate care of equipment and materials provided by the Council for the purposes of off-site working and should adhere to operating instructions and/or relevant policies and guidelines relating to their use (*e.g. for Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), see relevant sections of Health & Safety Information for Officers; Information Security Policy*).
- 9.8 Where an off-site worker leaves the Council or reverts to a predominantly office-based working arrangement, they must return all equipment supplied to them for the purposes of undertaking their duties on a mobile, variable or home working basis. All ICT resources should be returned to IT, in accordance with the Information Security Policy.
- 9.9 Employees are responsible for returning any equipment to the Council on request for the purposes of repair, maintenance and electrical testing. If this is not possible or practical, employees will be required to permit access to their premises in order for such works to be undertaken.
- 9.10 Employees must familiarise themselves and comply with all other relevant health & safety guidance. This may include permitting access to Council staff in order to undertake health and safety risk assessments for designated home working.

- 9.11 Off-site workers must cooperate with their line manager to ensure that they are working safely in off-site and home working environments.
- 9.12 Home workers must ensure that their workspace is
- Appropriate to the duties they are undertaking
 - Secure – with adequate security, storage and screening from external noise and activities
 - Adequately ventilated and lit.
- 9.13 Off-site workers must report any health and safety concerns to their line manager or Human Resources at their earliest opportunity. Additionally, any changes to their agreed off-site working environment must also be reported immediately
- 9.14 If an off-site worker injures him/herself while working off-site or in their home working environment, the incident must be reported to their line manager at the earliest opportunity and an accident form completed.
- 9.15 Home workers must not have meetings in their home with clients, customers or third parties for work purposes, or divulge their home address or home telephone number to external parties.
- 9.16 Mobile workers must comply with lone working procedures, to ensure that their whereabouts is known while undertaking their work duties.
N.B. Lone working policy available here:
<http://intranet/Community/HS/healthandsafetypolicy.htm>
- 9.17 Home workers will be required to complete a confidentiality agreement. Home working arrangements should not be initiated until a completed copy of the signed agreement has been returned to Human Resources to retain on file.
- 9.18 Employees are expected to take reasonable precautions to keep Council property and information secure. Confidential and personal data waste must be shredded or returned to the Council for proper disposal.
- 9.19 In the event of loss, theft or damage to Council equipment, employees must report the incident to ICT, Executive Head/Head of Service and/or local police (as appropriate) within 24 hours. If the incident is deemed to be the result of negligence or intentional misuse by the employee, the Council reserves the right to request the employee bear full or part responsibility for the repair costs or fair market value of the assessed equipment. If data is lost, report it to the Information Governance Manager.
- 9.20 Employees should advise their mortgage providers/landlords of their intention to initiate home working before the start date of this arrangement. The Council will not bear responsibility for any additional cost that is incurred as a result.
- 9.21 Employees should advise their home insurance providers of their intention to initiate home working before the start date of this arrangement. The Council

will not bear responsibility for any increase in premium that is incurred as a result.

- 9.22 Home workers should have suitable childcare/dependant care arrangements in place where appropriate.
- 9.23 Where an off-site worker is unable to undertake their duties according to the shift pattern agreed with their manager for any reason, they must inform their line manager (or Human Resources) as soon as possible. Notification should be in accordance with prior guidance from line managers regarding appropriate methods and times of contact for emergency incidences.
- 9.24 Please refer to the Council's House Rules for details of expectations of office-based staff, which will apply when working at Surrey Heath House.

10 Applying for an Off-site/Office-based Working Arrangement

- 10.1 Applications for a change in working arrangement may arise due to organisation-led changes that warrant review of existing conditions. For example as a result of:
- i) **an organisation-led change in approach to service delivery**
Working arrangements are dynamic by nature and may be subject to change in order to meet new challenges and organisational operations.
 - ii) **a role-related change in normal duties and/or responsibilities**
Where normal duties have been amended, employees may submit an application for off-site/on-site working to reflect this change in focus. A change in working arrangement may be granted where it is deemed to be beneficial for service delivery.
 - iii) **concerns about suitability of current working arrangement**
Where performance issues or personal circumstances result in current working arrangement being unsuitable, a review may be initiated by either management or the affected employee.
- N.B.** Changes to working arrangements require consultation with affected employees prior to being put into effect.
- 10.2 This policy does not cover flexible working requests, only role-related changes in working arrangements. For details on how to submit an application for flexible/home working due to personal reasons, see the Council's Flexible Working Policy (& Procedure).
- 10.3 The Council is not obliged to approve a request for changes to working arrangements, but is required to consider a valid request seriously. Employee requests for occasional or temporary off-site working may be declined on the basis of one or more business reasons, listed below:
- Unjustifiable cost (*e.g. supply of equipment*)
 - Detrimental impact on quality of work
 - Detrimental impact on performance
 - Detrimental effect on ability to meet customer demand
 - Inability to reorganise work among existing staff

- Inability to recruit additional staff
- Insufficiency of work during requested working periods
- Planned structural changes

N.B. The justifications above are bound by the Employment Rights Act 1996.

- 10.4 The Council reserves the right to provisionally accept off-site working requests with modifications.
- 10.5 Management-led proposals for changes to working arrangements may only be approved following presentation of a business case by the manager. The business case must include a cost analysis and clearly identify the benefits to the organisation (See Appendix II for template).

11 Termination of an Off-site/Office-based Working Arrangement

- 11.1 Once in place, a review of the individual's working arrangements will take place on a regular basis to ensure that the working arrangements are meeting the business needs of the Council and the personal needs of the employee.
- 11.2 Under normal circumstances, at least 28 calendar days' notice will be given to the employee advising the end of the arrangement. However, in exceptional circumstances or in the event of conflicting business need this notice period may be reduced.
- 11.3 If it is the employee that wishes to end the working agreement, the 28 days' notice period will also apply. A written request (stating reasons) to amend their working arrangement must be submitted to their line manager at least 28 calendar days prior to the requested effective date.
- 11.4 The Executive/Head of Service will decide whether it is possible to accommodate the request to revert to the proposed alternative working arrangement. Where this change involves the employee becoming an office-based worker with a fixed desk, this decision will depend on advice from the Facilities team and desk availability. The service area will incur any cost associated with the transfer from off-site to office-based working arrangements.
- 11.5 **Home Workers**
Termination of home working arrangements by managers will occur only in the event of sound business or performance-related reasons and after fully consulting the employee. Possible reasons for termination of arrangements include:
- Change in role of employee; eligibility criteria no longer met
 - Change in employee's personal circumstances resulting in home working being undesirable or impractical
 - Feedback indicating that home working arrangement has adversely affected team or service
 - Unsatisfactory employee conduct or performance.

11.6 **Mobile and Variable Workers**

In the event of operational emergencies or business/performance-related issues, the Council reserves the right to withdraw (temporarily or permanently) eligibility for off-site working and the employee will be required to utilise hot desk facilities instead of working off-site or from home. If appropriate, this may be enforced with immediate effect (*e.g. in cases of lack of staff cover to meet service requirements*).

11.7 **Office-based Workers**

In the event that a role is re-categorised to another working arrangement and this affects an employee in post, the individual will be fully consulted regarding the proposed change in working arrangements.

11.8 Where an employee has been asked to work off-site by the Council, the employee is entitled to decline the request but will be expected to provide reasons if asked.

12 **Hours of Work**

12.1 For existing employees, contractual hours of work will remain unchanged by subsequent working agreements unless altered by mutual consent (to be agreed by line manager). Off-site working does not automatically qualify an employee for flexible working hours or a change in working pattern

12.2 Where a line manager agrees that a home worker is not subject to fixed hours of work and free to perform the agreed work at times that suit them, the employee must still be available to respond to telephone calls or to meet with employer at specified **core hours**.

12.3 Off-site worker requests for changes in hours must be completed in the normal way as for office-based employees (see Flexible Working Policy).

12.4 Off-site workers that are contractually entitled to accrue hours under the flexi-time scheme should discuss the procedure for recording hours worked with their line manager.

12.5 Off-site workers are required to take regular adequate rest breaks in accordance with Working Time Regulations 1998. The minimum requirements for employee rest breaks are:

- At least 20 minutes break during each working day where the shift is longer than six hours
- A daily rest break of at least 11 continuous hours in each 24 hour working period (*i.e. time between finishing work on one working day and starting on the next*)
- A full day of no work each week (*this may be averaged as 2 days each period of 14 consecutive calendar days*).

13 **Equipment**

- 13.1 All equipment and materials necessary for off-site working will be supplied by the Council and maintained (or replaced, where necessary) by the Council. It should be noted that all equipment provided should only be used for Council business. This includes the provision of Personal Protection Equipment (PPE) and ICT resources.
- 13.2 The type of provided equipment provided to off-site workers depends on their role and which category of off-site worker they fall under. If you require clarification regarding which equipment the Council will supply for your role, please discuss with your line manager.
- 13.3 Off-site working agreements do not automatically entitle an employee to the provision of ICT equipment (e.g. laptop and peripherals). Where the employee will only work from home on a temporary or occasional basis, provision of ICT equipment may require booking out via the ICT Helpdesk (subject to Executive Head/Head of Service approval).
- 13.4 Employees with particular equipment needs will be assessed by the Health & Safety Advisor, who will advise regarding appropriate equipment to be procured.
- 13.5 Upon provision, an inventory of supplied equipment will be drawn up and signed by the employee and the manager.
- 13.6 All equipment remains the property of the Council and **must** be returned on demand. Generally the 'free return' period will extend for up to **one week** following termination of the off-site working agreement. In the event of employees leaving the Council, a deadline for return of equipment will be advised directly.
- 13.7 Any faults with Council-owned ICT equipment should be reported via the ICT Helpdesk in the usual manner. Where possible, attempts will be made to repair the fault remotely.
- 13.8 For further guidance regarding the proper use of Council ICT equipment please refer to the Information Security Policy.

14 Insurance & Liability

- 14.1 Employees undertaking authorised off-site work are covered by the Council's employer's liability insurance to the same extent as office-based workers. However, the extent of the insurance will in some cases be limited by the circumstances and nature of the loss/damage incurred.
- 14.2 It is the employee's responsibility to check with relevant third parties (e.g. insurers) to ensure that they have the relevant permissions to work from home without restrictions or penalty. The Council will not be liable for any charges related to investigating or obtaining such confirmation.

15 Sickness

- 15.1 In the event of being too unwell to work, off-site workers must advise their line managers at their earliest convenience. The Council's Sickness & Absence Policy and Procedure applies for all staff, including the requirement for completion of return to work interviews.

16 Tax & Allowances

- 16.1 Employees working from home should be aware that this may affect their capital gains tax liability if they were to sell or otherwise dispose of their home or if they occupy a room for no other purpose than to conduct their work from home. It is recommended that the employee investigates the potential implications of home working on their personal finances prior to application or initiation of the agreement.
- 16.2 The Council will not cover any costs of heating, lighting, consumables or additional telephone costs incurred as a result of working at home. The saving in travel expenses incurred in travelling to work is deemed to cover any additional household costs.

Document revisions

Document revised (date)	Details of revisions made	Version



APPENDIX I

Manager-Staff Consultation Meeting Summary

Change to Working Arrangement

This form must be completed following consultation with employee regarding change to work arrangement application, regardless of the outcome.

Date of Meeting _____

Employee Name
Job Title
Team
Service

Proposed Working Arrangement (see *Off-site Working Policy* for definitions)

Home Worker		Variable Worker	
Mobile Worker		Office-based Worker	

Shift Pattern

Hours per week	
Days per week (specify)	
Core hours*	

** Where a line manager agrees that a home worker is not subject to fixed hours of work and free to perform the agreed work at times that suit them, the employee must still be available to respond to telephone calls or to meet with employer at specified **core hours***

Additional Resources

Tick additional resources/equipment required for the proposed working arrangement.

Personal Protection Equipment (PPE) _____

ICT Equipment _____

Communication

Tick relevant methods of communication for this role:

Home Visits		Emails	
Telephone Calls		On-site Meetings	

In accordance with the Off-site Working Policy:

- Managers must maintain regular contact with off-site workers in their team by phone and in person (where practicable).
- Off-site employees must maintain an appropriate amount of contact with their line manager and colleagues.

Provide details below of what arrangements will be employed to ensure that effective communication between employee and manager is maintained.

Employees requesting home working arrangements should consider whether they have the appropriate attributes required for effective working under such conditions. Discuss with the employee and provide supporting evidence for how they intend to manage each aspect.

- Self-discipline
- The ability to work without direct supervision
- Good organisational skills
- Effective time management
- Ability to cope with potentially conflicting demands of work and family

If home visits required, confirm date of first visit: _____

Manager approval for working arrangement granted? **Yes / No**

Please provide details to support your decision:

If approved, please indicate preferred effective date: _____

APPROVAL

Signature (Manager) _____ Date: _____

Signature (Executive Head) _____ Date: _____



APPENDIX II Business Case

Organisation-Led Change to Working Arrangement

This form must be completed following consultation with employee regarding change to work arrangement application, regardless of the outcome.

1. Does the working arrangement relate to:
 - i. A new post YES / NO
 - ii. An established post YES / NO

2. Does the working arrangement affect employees in-post? (requires consultation)

3.

a. **Current Working Arrangement** *(see Off-site Working Policy for definitions)*

Home Worker		Variable Worker	
Mobile Worker		Office-based Worker	

b. **Proposed Working Arrangement** *(see Off-site Working Policy for definitions)*

Home Worker		Variable Worker	
Mobile Worker		Office-based Worker	

4. **Additional Resources**

Indicate additional resources/equipment required for the proposed working arrangement.

- a. **Personal Protection Equipment (PPE)** YES / NO

Please provide details below:

- b. **ICT Equipment** YES / NO

Please provide details below:

5. Has a Workplace Risk Assessment been carried out? YES / NO (please attach)

6. What is the expected duration of the proposed arrangement? _____

7. Business Case Assessment

a. Benefits to organisation.

b. Risks to organisation.

c. Potential costs.

d. Other considerations.

APPROVAL

Signature (Manager)

Date:

Signature (Executive Head)

Date:

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 11
November 2014**

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

+ Cllr Richard Brooks	- Cllr Colin Dougan
+ Cllr Keith Bush	+ Cllr Craig Fennell
- Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Charlotte Morley

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates and Cllr Chris Pitt

65/E Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 21 October 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

66/E 2020 Economic Development Strategy

Since the economic downturn in 2008/09, economic development at the local level had become an area of increased focus for both national and local government. In response the Council had produced its first economic development strategy in 2011, which was a broad based document reflecting the picture as it stood at the time.

The recent economic downturn had directly led to an increased role for local councils in the economic development and wellbeing of their local areas. The Borough Council's Corporate Plan, the '2020 Strategy', contained an objective to 'Sustain and promote our local economy.... By supporting local business and encouraging economic development'.

With the national and local perspectives having developed further, it was considered timely to refresh the Council's original strategy and agree a document with more specific objectives and actions than its predecessor.

The 2020 Economic Development Strategy focused on three main themes:

- A sustainable place to live, work, shop and play
- A great place for business to flourish
- A great place for people to succeed

From these overarching themes objectives had been set and a range of actions and action plans developed to deliver the key elements of the strategy. Members highlighted a number of the Aims contained in the Strategy, in particular the Aim to deepen military connections its associated action points, including the Council leading a joint programme across the EM3 LEP area.

Members recognised that at present the Strategy was principally focused upon Camberley Town Centre, but as the document developed it would place a greater emphasis upon other parts of the borough. It was agreed that the Executive would receive an annual report and update on the Strategy.

RESOLVED to

- (i) adopt the 2020 Economic Development Strategy, the three themes as set out above and the Action plans; and**
- (ii) receive an annual report on the Strategy.**

67/E Response to Surrey County Council Local Transport Plan 3 Consultation

The Executive was informed that Surrey County Council had published a consultation document seeking views on the proposed “Surrey Heath Draft Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme”, which would form part of the Surrey Transport Plan.

The purpose of the Strategy and Forward Programme was to support the growth set out within the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2011-2028 and Camberley Town Centre Area Action Plan and provide a programme of transport infrastructure required to deliver this growth. It would provide an evidence base for future funding bids. Due to the date of receipt of the consultation an officer response had been submitted.

The Surrey Heath Draft Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme described Surrey Heath’s transport network, including its current issues and challenges, together with assessing the potential impact of future growth upon the transport network. The Forward Programme contained a number of short, medium and long term schemes for the highway network. The Forward Programme incorporated all projects for which Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Local Growth funding had been, or was due to be sought, including:

- A30/A331 Meadows Roundabout Improvements;
- Camberley Town Centre Highways Improvements;
- A package of sustainable transport works for Camberley;
- Camberley Town Centre Public Realm Improvements which could include the RMA Frontage;
- Business Centre Access Improvements (between Watchmoor and Yorktown Business Parks and Camberley Town Centre);
- Camberley Railway Station Improvements;
- Frimley Transport Network Improvements.

In response to the consultation, officers had advised that the objectives of the Strategy were welcomed and that the Council was pleased that the Forward Programme incorporated all projects for which LEP funding had been, or was due to be sought.

The Executive noted a number of points of clarification and accuracy which had been addressed by officers for inclusion in the final Strategy and Forward Programme.

RESOLVED that the response submitted to Surrey County Council by officers on the consultation on the Surrey Heath Draft Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme, as set out in Annex A to the agenda report, be endorsed.

68/E Family Support Project Roll Forward to Beyond 2015

The Executive was reminded that, since September 2013, the Council had been working with Surrey County Council to deliver a Family Support Project on behalf of Surrey Heath and Runnymede Borough Councils. The Project sought to address poor school attendance, unemployment, and anti-social behaviour in participating families. It was reported that the Runnymede and Surrey Heath Team would meet its targets for successful working with families ahead of schedule. In addition, the Team had pioneered a successful family therapy pilot.

The Project was currently funded through the County Council distributing grant monies from the government's Troubled Families Programme. The initial project had been due to run until March 2015; however, in June 2015 the Treasury had announced that an extra £200 million would be available for the period 2015/16 and for a five year period thereafter to fund the project through payment by results money. Members were advised that, if funding concerns arose in the future, then a further report would be brought to the Executive.

At its meeting on 4 February 2014, Surrey County Council's Cabinet had resolved to take forward the Family Support Programme to 2020 through the Public Service Transformation agenda. This would include scaling up the Family Support Programme to include a wider range of families by broadening the criteria for eligibility to include working with families with a mental health issue.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Family Support Project continue to be supported and provided by Surrey Heath on behalf of Surrey Heath and Runnymede Borough Councils;**
- (ii) the project be funded from government funding specifically for the delivery of the national 'troubled families' programme and any other such appropriate grant funding as may become available;**
- (iii) the Executive Head Regulatory, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Regulatory, be authorised to extend the agreement with Runnymede Borough Council for this project; and**
- (iv) the Executive Head of Regulatory, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Regulatory and Runnymede Borough Council, be authorised to enter into an Agreement with Surrey**

County Council setting out the arrangements and responsibilities including funding.

69/E Surrey County Council Consultation - In-House Residential Care Homes for Older People

Surrey County Council owned 30 residential care homes for older people, of which six homes were maintained and operated by the County Council. One of the homes was Pinehurst in Park Road, Camberley.

A comprehensive review of the six older people's residential care homes had been undertaken. Surrey County Council's Cabinet had received a report which outlined the findings of the review and agreed a consultation process to take place with residents, their families, carers, staff and appropriate stakeholders to enable the County Council to make an informed decision on the future of its in-house care homes.

It was reported that the Executive Head of Community had been asked to look into whether the proposal would affect any of his services; any concerns identified would be included in the Council's consultation response.

It was also agreed to ask the County Council to ensure that the consultation took into account the vulnerability of the care home residents and to recognise that some may be without support from relatives. Members further suggested that it might be appropriate to appoint a champion to advocate these residents' needs.

RESOLVED to authorise the Executive Head of Community Services, after consultation with the Leader and the Portfolio Holder for Community, to submit a response to the consultation, taking into account the points raised at the meeting.

70/E Child Eyes Campaign

The Executive was informed that a request has been received from a local resident that the Council support the Child Eyes Campaign.

Child Eyes was a movement and a campaign which had begun in October 2012 as a project to demonstrate the abundance of sexual and violent images that children saw in their normal daily lives. The initial idea had been to collect as many images as possible and create a hard hitting film showing how much children see that adults were not always aware of. The project had grown and was now campaigning on many issues based around protecting children from negative, sexual and sexist images in public.

Members expressed their support for the campaign and agreed to publicise the campaign where possible, on the basis of no extra cost to the Council. Options considered for publicising the campaign included publishing an article in Heathscene and contacting Parish Councils and Collectively Camberley Business Improvement District.

RESOLVED to support the Child Eyes Campaign in principle and agreed to publicise the campaign through appropriate methods, subject to there being no additional cost to the Council.

71/E Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the ground that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as set out below:

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Paragraph(s)</u>
72/E	3
73/E	3

Note: Minute 72/E is a summary of matters considered in Part II of the agenda, the minutes of which it is considered should remain confidential at the present time.

72/E Lease of Part First Floor of the Ian Goodchild Centre to Surrey Heath Carers.

The Executive made decisions relating to the granting of a lease for part of the first floor of the Ian Goodchild Centre, Camberley to Surrey Heath Carers.

73/E Review of Exempt Items

The Executive reviewed the report which had been considered at the meeting following the exclusion of members of the press and public, as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information.

Resolved that the resolution at minute 72/E be made public but the minute and report remain exempt until completion of the negotiations.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 22 September 2014

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Glyn Carpenter (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr David Allen	+ Cllr Ken Pedder
+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Audrey Roxburgh
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Ian Sams
- Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Surinder Gandhum	+ Cllr Judi Trow
+ Cllr David Hamilton	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr David Mansfield	+ Cllr John Winterton

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Paul Deach (from min 42/P to min 45/P), Cllr John May and Cllr Charlotte Morley (from min 42/p to 44/P)

Officers in attendance: Lee Brewin, Duncan Carty, Michelle Fielder, Jessica Harris-Hooton, Gareth John, Aneta Mantio, Jonathan Partington, Paul Sherman

42/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 26 August 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

43/P Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers - Development Functions

The Committee received a report on a revised Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers in respect of the Development Functions of the Council. It was noted that the current scheme had been in existence for a number of years and required a review to provide a flexible generic and user friendly scheme to meet the needs of a modern local authority.

Resolved that the Governance Working Group be advised that the amended Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers in respect of the Development Functions be recommended to Council.

44/P Application Number: 14/0396 1 Heatherdale Road, Camberley Surrey GU15 2LR - Watchetts Ward

The application was for the erection of additional detached dwelling on land to the rear of 1 Heatherdale Road that would be retained on reduced curtilage. (Additional plan rec'd 07/07/14). (Amended plans rec'd 22/08/2014).

The application would normally be delegated to officers in accordance with the scheme of delegation. A ward member had, however, called it in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Following a re-consultation, further 33 letters from 21 households were received, 2 of which are in support of the application and the remainder in objection. The letters raise the same issues as previously, with the view that the amended scheme did not go far enough to overcome their concerns. Material considerations are addressed in the report.'

Some Members felt that the proposal constituted 'garden grabbing', and would result in an increase in traffic in a wooded hill area. Other Members could see no reason to refuse the proposal as the amendments had satisfied previous reasons for refusal.

Resolved that application 14/0396 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As the application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Bond and Mr Grundy spoke in objection and Mr Wentworth the applicant spoke in support.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor Ken Pedder and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve:

Councillors Glyn Carpenter, David Mansfield, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow and Valerie White.

45/P Application Number: 14/0630 22 Windsor Road, Chobham, Surrey GU24 8LA - Chobham Ward

The application was for the change of use from a dwelling house (C3) to a mixed use comprising a dentist (D1) at ground floor and a residential (C3) flat at first floor level with creation of a rear dormer window and associated alterations (part retrospective).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'There have been a further 24 letters of support (36 in total) and a further 2 objections (5 in total) have been received. No new material planning considerations have been raised.

Amended County Highway Authority response:

The County Highway Authority now advise that no restoration works to the northern access are required as there is no dropped kerb in this location. The any works on site can be controlled by the landscaping condition and therefore condition 5 can be deleted.

The recommendation remains as set out in the report, subject to the removal of condition 5.'

Some Members sought clarification on the number of parking spaces at the site in relation to the proposed number of treatment rooms and the dwelling. Members were advised that six spaces were allocated to the treatment 4 rooms and one space for the residential unit. This was slightly above the required County Highways Agency standards and there was also a public car park close by.

Some Members were concerned about the existing parking issues and were keen for condition 5 to be retained, particularly with reference to the retention of the gate on the northern access. Members were informed that there would be no access via this entrance and therefore condition 5 was not needed as suggested by the County Highway Authority.

There was also concern about the appearance of a soil pipe on the outside wall where the lounge area was proposed. It was explained that this was put in place when the proposal made previously was for two flats and this would not be used.

Resolved that application 14/0630 be approved as amended subject to:

i) Conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory;

ii) the completion of a suitable planning obligation to secure the following:

- a financial contribution of £10,446.06 to mitigate the impact of the development on local infrastructure, in accordance with the Developer Contributions SPD.**

In the event that a satisfactory planning obligation has not been completed by the 3 October 2014, the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to refuse the application for the following reason:

- 1. In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP12 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and**

Development Management Policies 2012 in relation to the provision of infrastructure contributions towards transport, libraries and indoor sports in accordance with the requirements of Surrey Heath Borough Councils Developer Contributions SPD.

Note 1

For the record it was noted that Councillor Pat Tedder declared that she was registered at the applicant's surgery and that the application was discussed at a Chobham Parish Council meeting but she had not been present.

Note 2

As the application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Young and Mrs Young spoke in objection and Dr Patel the applicant spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation as amended was proposed by Councillor Glyn Carpenter and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

Note 4

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve as amended:
Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve:
Councillor Judi Trow.

46/P Application Number: 14/0598 1 Kings Road, West End, Woking GU24 9LN - West End Ward

The application was for the erection of a pair of semi-detached properties following demolition of the existing dwelling.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The legal agreement in terms of the proposal's mitigation towards the TBH SPA and the infrastructure has been received.

Further comments from the agent have been received that relate to inaccuracies within the committee report and their disagreement with the conclusions reached. In inaccuracies relate to the dimensions that were not annotated on the submitted drawings and were therefore scaled off the submitted plans. The correct dimensions are:

- Para 4.2 – the lower eaves height 4.65m rather than 5.9m stated in the report;*

- *Para 7.3.3 – the maximum separation distance between the proposed dwellings and the front boundary would be approximately 14m rather than 9m stated in the report.'*

Resolved that application 14/0598 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Members of the Committee had received emails from the applicant.

Note 2

The recommendation to refuse was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Judi Trow.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

47/P Application Number: 14/0567 Land rear of 48-50 Guildford Road, Lightwater GU18 5SD - Lightwater Ward

The application was for the erection of a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings on land rear of 48-50 Guildford Road with new access off Broadway Road, car parking and landscaping with associated works.

Members were advised of the following:

'No legal agreement to mitigate the impact of the proposal in terms of Thames Basin Heath SPA and the infrastructure has been received and therefore the reasons for refusal remain as outlined in the agenda.'

Some Members felt that the proposal would only result in loss of amenities to the immediate neighbours.

Resolved that application 14/0567 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse was proposed by Councillor Valerie White and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse:
Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

48/P Application Number: 14/0608 Larkfield, School Road, Windlesham GU20 6PB - Windlesham Ward

The application was for the erection of 2 two storey detached dwellings, both with rooms in the roof space with double integral or attached garages following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of two pairs of 2.25m high entrance gates with 1.8m high front fence.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'No unilateral undertaking to mitigate the impact of the development on Thames Basin Heath SPA or infrastructure has been submitted and therefore these have to be added as additional reasons for refusal:

- The Planning Authority, following an Appropriate Assessment and in the light of available information and the representations of Natural England, is unable to satisfy itself that the proposal (in combination with other projects) would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and the relevant Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI). In this respect, significant concerns remain with regard to adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area in that there is likely to be an increase in dog walking, general recreational use and damage to the habitat and the protection of protected species within the protected areas. Accordingly, since the planning authority is not satisfied that Regulation 62 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulation 2010 (The Habitats Regulation) applies in this case, it must refuse permission in accordance with Regulation 61 (5) of the Habitats Regulations and Article 6 (3) of Directive 92/43/EE. For the same reasons the proposal conflicts with guidance contained in the NPPF and Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012, Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) and Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted January 2012).*
- In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP12 Infrastructure Delivery and Implementation of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 in relation to the provision of infrastructure contributions towards transport, libraries, community facilities and recycling, in accordance with the requirements of the Surrey Heath Borough Council's 'Planning Obligations and Infrastructure Provision Tariff Scheme. The proposal would therefore contribute to unacceptable additional pressure on local infrastructure to the detriment of the locality.'*

Resolved that application 14/0608 be refused as amended for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse as amended was proposed by Councillor Glyn Carpenter and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse as amended:
Councillors David Allen, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, , Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse as amended: Councillor Ken Pedder.

Councillor Richard Brooks abstained.

49/P Application Number: 14/0616 Saddlers Halt, 86 High Street, Chobham, Woking GU24 8LZ - Chobham Ward

The Committee was advised that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

50/P Application Number: 14/0439 18 Park Street, Camberley Surrey GU15 3PL - St Michaels Ward

The application was for the erection of a four storey building to provide ground floor retail (Class A1) with 8 serviced (Hotel) apartments (Class C1) and boundary wall to rear following the demolition of existing building.

Members were advised of the following updates:

‘Clarification:

Policy TC1 of the Camberley Town Centre Action Area Plan 2014 indicates that: “Contributions will be sought from all developments towards the cost of delivering infrastructure which contributes towards achieving the strategy and objectives for the Town Centre. Contributions will also be sought towards the cost of environmental improvements within the town centre.”

It is considered that for the scale of the proposed development (which is a minor development), with the amount of floorspace and number of Class C1 units, it is not considered contributions towards environmental improvements in the town centre can be secured. This type of contribution would only be secured for major development.

The Developer Contributions SPD 2011 requires contributions towards a range of infrastructure.

This has been calculated to include:

Transport: £3,875

Libraries: £151

Indoor sports: £537

Total: £4,563

A unilateral undertaking has been completed to provide infrastructure contributions, as set out above, to meet the requirements of the Developers SPD 2011.

Members were advised that as a unilateral agreement had been signed the recommendation had been changed to approve.

Resolved that application 14/0439 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve as amended was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Audrey Roxburgh.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve as amended:
Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

51/P Application Number: 14/0036 26 Portsmouth Road, Camberley GU15 1JX - St Pauls Ward

The application was for the erection of a two storey detached dwelling with surgery and associated parking following the demolition of existing dwelling and surgery. (Amended plan rec'd 19/03/14 & amended tree report rec'd 07/04/14). (Amended & additional plans rec'd 27/05/14).

This application would normally be delegated to officers in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers. A ward member had called it in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Some Members were concerned about the bulk of the proposal and felt that a condition would be necessary for the retention of the trees and particularly the Yew. Some Members also felt that informative 4 should be amended to read '*the applicant is required to contact the owner/occupier.....*'.

The Members were advised that the trees were poor and replacements would be required. Condition 5 allowed flexibility in respect of landscaping at the site. Members were also advised that enforcement could not be included in an informative.

Resolved that application 14/0036 be approved subject to:

- i) Conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory;**
- ii) the completion of a suitable obligation to secure the following:**
 - A satisfactory legal obligation to secure contributions in accordance with the Council's Tariff Scheme and Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (2011), by the application expiry date of 22 October 2014 and at no cost to the Council.**

In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement is not completed to mitigate the impact of the development in line with the Council's Tariff Scheme by the 22 October 2014, the Executive Head of Regulatory Services be authorised to refuse this application for the following reason:

- In the absence of a completed legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the Developer Contributions SPD (Oct 2011) and Circular 05/2005. The proposal would therefore contribute to unacceptable additional pressure on local infrastructure to the detriment of the locality.**

Note 1

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor David Hamilton and seconded by Councillor David Allen.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

52/P Application Number: 14/0745 Unit 1A Watchmoor Road, Camberley GU15 3AQ - St Michaels Ward

The application was for the change of use from car sales (Sui Generis) to an Acrobatics Centre (Use class D2).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'There have now been 2 letters of support received and a further supporting statement has been received from the applicant advising of the benefits of the scheme and identifying other vacant commercial floor space in the area. Officers accept that there are benefits associated with the scheme and these are summarised in the committee report. While the applicant has provided details of other vacant properties there is no information of the circumstance, how long these properties have been vacant or whether any are subject to offers. The applicant has also not considered whether there are other sites, outside the Core Employment Area, which would be suitable for their use.'

For these reasons the recommendation remains as set out in the report.'

The officers had recommended that the application be refused on the grounds that it would result in the loss of the existing employment use and would introduce a leisure use which would not support the integrity or the function of the Core Employment Area.

Members were of the opinion that the proposal would increase employment in the area, would bring benefit to the community and promote health and wellbeing. The reasons to approve the application outweighed the reason to refuse under the Policy CP8 of the Council's Core Strategy.

Members suggested standard conditions for the approval to include those related to hours of operation, types of materials, restricting the use to gymnastics/acrobatics, built to the approved plans, building to take place within three years and include highway conditions.

Resolved that application 14/0475 be approved subject to standard conditions, as summarised above, the wording to be finalised by the Executive Head – Regulatory, after consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Ward Members.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Members of the Committee had received an email from the applicant.

Note 2

The revised recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the revised recommendation to approve:
Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

53/P

**Application Number: 14/0621 21 -25 Tekels Park, Camberley Surrey GU15
2LE - Town Ward**

The application was for the erection of 3 two storey detached dwellings with accommodation in the roof space and a two storey detached building to comprise 4 duplex apartments following the demolition of the existing building. (Amended plans rec'd 12/08/14).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'One additional letter of objection has been raised; the material considerations are addressed in the committee report.

A consultation response has been received from West Surrey Badger Group. This raises an objection to the proposal as detailed below:

'The applicant has not considered the impact of the development on badgers which are known to be present in the Tekels Park area and accordingly permission should be refused'

Accordingly it is recommended that an additional reason for refusal is included:

It has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not impact on protected species, in particular badgers, which are likely to be present on the application and the surrounding area. The development is therefore contrary to the objectives of Policy CP14 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

The recommendation remains as set out in the report subject to the additional reason for refusal.'

Some Members sought clarification as to whether Tekels Park was a development area. It was confirmed that it was a settlement area.

Resolved that application 14/0621 be refused for the reasons as amended as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse as amended was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the revised recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

**Application Number: 14/0757 71a High Street, Chobham, Woking Surrey
GU24 8AF - Chobham Ward**

The application was for erection of a part two storey side extension, a detached car port and change of use of site from office to a single dwelling house.

Members were advised of the following update:

'Report correction - Recommendation 2 should read 9th October not 9th June.'

Clarification was sought on the use of the workshop and it was confirmed that it would only be for personal use. Planning permission would be required for any commercial usage.

Some Members were concerned about the impact of the loss of office units on the High Street.

Resolved that application 14/0757 be approved as amended subject to:

- i) Conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory;**
- ii) the completion of a suitable planning obligation to secure the following:**
 - a financial contribution of £5,297 to mitigate the impact of the development on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, in accordance with the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD**

In the event that a satisfactory planning obligation has not been completed by the 9 October 2014, the Executive Head - Regulatory be authorised to refuse the application for the following reasons:

- 1. The Planning Authority, following an Appropriate Assessment and in the light of available information and the representations of Natural England, is unable to satisfy itself that the proposal (in combination with other projects) would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and the relevant Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI). In this respect, significant concerns remain with regard to adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area in that there is likely to be an increase in dog walking, general recreational use and damage to the habitat and the protection of protected species within the protected areas. Accordingly, since the planning authority is not satisfied that Regulation 62 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulation 2010 (The Habitats Regulation) applies in this case, it must refuse permission in accordance with Regulation 61 (5) of the Habitats Regulations and Article 6 (3) of Directive 92/43/EE. For the same reasons the proposal conflicts with guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement 9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation).**

Note 1

The recommendation to approve as amended was proposed by Councillor Glyn carpenter and seconded by Councillor Ken Pedder.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve as amended:
Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve as amended: Councillors Pat Tedder and Judi Trow.

55/P Application Number: 13/0639 25 High Street, Bagshot Surrey GU19 5AF - Bagshot Ward

The application was for the Listed Building Consent for the replacement of a ground floor wood framed window.

Resolved that application 14/0639 be approved as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Glyn Carpenter.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:
Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

56/P Application Number: 14/0651 12 Dean Parade, Camberley Surrey GU15 4DQ - Old Dean Ward

This application was for the change of use of premises from Class B1 (Business) to Class A1 (Barbers Shop).

Resolved that application 14/0651 be approved as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor David Allen and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Chairman

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 22 October 2014

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Glyn Carpenter (Vice Chairman)

- Cllr David Allen	+ Cllr Ken Pedder
- Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Audrey Roxburgh
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Ian Sams
+ Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Surinder Gandhum	- Cllr Judi Trow
+ Cllr David Hamilton	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr David Mansfield	+ Cllr John Winterton

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Paul Ilnicki (In place of Cllr David Allen).

In Attendance: Cllr Josephine Hawkins(to min 61/P)

Cllr Glyn Carpenter in attendance from min 59/P

Cllr Surinder Gandhum in attendance from part-way through min 58/P

Officers in attendance:

Lee Brewin, Duncan Carty, Michelle Fielder, Jessica Harris-Hooton, Gareth John, Jonathan Partington, Neil Praine and Paul Sherman.

57/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

58/P Application Number: 14/0360 - Sycamore House (formerly Vernon House), 16 Southwell Park Road, Camberley GU15 3PY - St Michaels Ward

This application was for the erection of a three storey building comprising 5 two bedroom flats following demolition of existing 8 bedroom HMO.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'A legal agreement has been completed
Refusal reasons 2 and 3 and the Informative are to be deleted.'*

Members felt that the proposal was out of character.

Resolved that application 14/0360 be refused as amended for the reason as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- Cllr Colin Dougan declared that he lived in Southwell Park Road;
- Cllr Edward Hawkins declared that some years ago he had worked with Mr Pickett, one of the speakers.

Note 2

As this application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Pickett spoke in objection.

Note 3

The recommendation to refuse as amended was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

Note 4

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse as amended:
Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

59/P Application Number: 14/0676 - 2 Bonds Drive, Pennypot Lane, Chobham GU24 8DJ - Chobham Ward

This application was for the variation of condition 2 of application SU/10/0665 (Appeal ref: APP/D3640/A/10/2144152) relating to the continued use of the land as a travelling show people site with siting of caravans, mobile homes, equipment storage and associated landscaping. The proposed variation seeks to maintain the overall number of caravans and mobile homes on plots 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 at 13 but to allow 7 (as opposed to 6) of these to be mobile homes or static caravans (the proposal specifically relates to plot 2).

The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, at the request of a local ward councillor (given the extensive history of the site) it had been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'One further letter of objection has been received. This does not raise any new material considerations.'

Some Members were concerned that the touring caravan would not be removed once the static mobile home had been sited. Officers advised that condition 3 had been added to ensure this. However, some Members felt that the condition should be amended to'in the event Ms N Martin or Ms S Martin vacate the plot, the static caravan occupied.....'

In addition, it was felt that an additional condition be added 'to ensure that the existing touring caravan on the plot be permanently removed when the replacement static caravan or mobile home is moved onto the site'.

Resolved that application 14/0676 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and the amendment to condition 3 and additional condition as described above.

Note 1

It was declared that councillors using mobile devices during the meeting were not tweeting but were taking notes regarding the meeting.

Note 2

As this application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Bain spoke in objection and Mr Maniar, the agent spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve as amended was proposed by Councillor Ken Pedder and seconded by Councillor Audrey Roxburgh.

Note 4

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve as amended:
Councillors Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Paul Innicki, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve as amended:
Councillor Pat Tedder.

60/P Application Number: 14/0650 - 38 Fairfield Drive, Frimley, Camberley GU16 8RL - Parkside Ward

This application was for the erection of a single storey front extension and porch and two story rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory. (Amended plans rec'd 15/09/14).

The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, at the request of a local ward councillor it had been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

A site visit was carried out at the site.

The Ward Member, Councillor Josephine Hawkins, felt that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the neighbouring properties and would detract from the character of the area. In the event that the Committee approved the application,

Councillor Hawkins requested that no more permitted development rights would be allowed.

Some Members of the Committee agreed that the proposal was overbearing.

It was proposed that a condition be added to remove permitted development rights for class A and E and the garage to be retained. Officers advised that permitted development rights should only be removed in exceptional circumstances and that there should be clear reasons for doing so. The reasoning given by Members was because of the overall bulk of development in relation to the overall site.

Resolved that application 14/0650 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and an additional condition to restrict permitted development rights as described above.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve as amended was proposed by Councillor Glyn Carpenter and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve as amended:
Councillors Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Paul Inicki, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

61/P Application Number: 14/0232 - 2 Kings Road, West End, Woking, GU24 9LN - West End Ward

This application was for the outline application for the erection of 2 detached houses with attached garages following the demolition of existing bungalow (all matters reserved).

Members were advised of the following updates:

Amendment to Informative:

'In respect of reasons for refusal 3 and 4, please note that the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule is scheduled to take effect on 1st December 2014 at which point a legal agreement securing a financial contribution towards transport, libraries, community facilities and recycling under the Surrey Heath Developer's Contributions SPD 2012 and a legal agreement to provide SANG [Suitable Area of Natural Greenspace] mitigation under the Thames Basin Heath SPA Avoidance Strategy SPD 2011 will no longer be required as CIL will replace this.

However, it will be necessary for such proposals to still meet the requirements of Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management

Policies 2012, Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (the Habitats Regulations). In this respect, an objection by the Council on these grounds will only be removed where there is available SANG capacity at the point of the validation of any subsequent appeal.

In addition, a contribution towards SAMM [Strategic Access Management and Monitoring] would still remain to be provided and secured through a legal agreement to meet the requirements of the Thames Basin Heath SPA Avoidance Strategy SPD 2011, the above policies and the Habitats Regulations. Therefore, if this decision is appealed and subsequently granted planning permission at appeal after the Council's CIL Charging Schedule has taken effect, this scheme will be liable to pay the Council's CIL upon commencement of development. CIL will therefore in all other respects overcome these reasons for refusal. '

Resolved that application 14/0232 be refused as amended for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse as amended was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse as amended:
Councillors Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Paul Inicki, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

62/P Application Number: 14/0590 - Ascot Park Polo Club, Westcroft Park Farm, Windlesham Road, Chobham GU24 8SN - Chobham Ward

This application was for the erection of a two storey detached dwelling with accommodation in the roof space and a detached garage building with accommodation above following the demolition of existing buildings.

Members were advised of the following updates:

Consultation:

Comments have now been received from Surrey Wildlife Trust and it is considered that subject to the following additional conditions the development would not impact on Bats within the site:

“Should any of the buildings shown to be demolished not be demolished within 1 year of the grant of planning permission then those buildings shall not be demolished and no further development shall take place until a further Phase II Bat Survey of those buildings shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority along with proposals for any additional mitigation

required. Development shall not resume until the Local Planning Authority has agreed a scheme of mitigation or given confirmation that additional mitigation is not required.

Reason: To ensure the development would not impact on protected species and to accord with the objectives of Policy CP14 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.”

The response also raises concerns in respect of a dead oak tree (T2) which the applicant has indicated would be removed. The development, however, does not require the removal of this and the removal of this tree cannot be prevented through planning conditions given that this would not be development. Accordingly it is recommended that the following informative is included:

The applicant is advised that the dead oak trees on site, and in particular T2, are likely to be in use by Bats for roosting. The removal of these trees may therefore require a Protected Species Licence and the applicant is advised to contact their ecologist for further information on this requirement.

Subject to the additional condition and informative the recommendation therefore remains to approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and the additional conditions set out in the update documents.’

Some Members asked whether planning permission would be required should the livery be re-instated or the garage block be converted to residential units. Officers advised that planning permission would have to be sought for these changes.

Resolved that application 14/0590 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve as amended was proposed by Councillor Ken Pedder and seconded by David Hamilton.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve as amended:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, , Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to approve as amended:

Councillors Glyn Carpenter, David Mansfield, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

63/P

Application Number: 14/0794 - Alenia Marconi Systems, Lyon Way, Frimley GU16 7EX - Frimley Ward

The Committee was advised that the application had been deferred to a future meeting. Additional neighbour notification had been undertaken and further time should be given for residents to make comment.

64/P Application Number: 14/0771 - Little Paddock, Swift Lane, Bagshot GU19 5NJ - Bagshot Ward

This application was for the erection of an extension to existing dwelling to create a new semi-detached dwelling and the erection of a new detached dwelling.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Consultation:

The Arboricultural Officer has confirmed that he has no objection to the development subject to the imposition of suitable conditions. There are included in the current recommendation.

The applicant has now completed the Unilateral Undertaking and therefore the recommendation is now to approve subject to the conditions set out in the report.'

Some Members felt that Whitmore Road already had traffic issues and they felt that this proposal would add to these concerns.

Resolved that application 14/0771 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The application was proposed by Councillor Audrey Roxburgh and seconded by Councillor Ken Pedder.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve as amended:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve as amended:

Councillors Glyn Carpenter, David Mansfield, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and Ian Sams

65/P Application Number: 14/0549 - Brook Place Cottage, Bagshot Road, Chobham GU24 8SJ - West End Ward

This application was for the erection of single storey, rear extensions, single storey front extension and the conversion of the garage to habitable accommodation. (Amended plans rec'd 14/07/2014 & 20/08/2014).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The objection from the adjoining property has now been withdrawn and this resident now supports the proposal.'

Further to this notification, Members were advised that the objection had been withdrawn.

Members were informed that the house was the listed building and the cottage was in the curtilage.

Resolved that application 14/0549 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The application was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Paul Ilnicki.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:

Councillors Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

66/P Application Number: 14/0550 - Brook Place Cottage, Bagshot Road, Chobham GU24 8SJ - West End Ward

This application was for the Listed Building Consent for the erection of a part single storey, part first floor extension, single storey front extensions and the conversion of the garage to habitable accommodation. (Amended plans rec'd 14/07/2014), (Amended plans rec'd 21/08/14).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The objection from the adjoining property has now been withdrawn and this resident now supports the proposal.'

Further to this notification, Members were advised that the objection had been withdrawn.

Members were informed that the house was the listed building and the cottage was in the curtilage.

Resolved that application 0550 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Glyn Carpenter.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:

Councillors Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Paul Inicki, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

67/P Application Number: 14/0807 - House of Barns, Sandpit Hall Road, Chobham GU24 8HA - Chobham Ward

This application was for the change of use of existing annexe and stable/garage block to a 1 bed independent residential unit of accommodation.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'A legal agreement securing a contribution towards SANGS and Planning Infrastructure has been completed (21/10/2014). As such, the recommendation is to approve subject to conditions.'

Resolved that application 14/0807 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory;

Note 1

The application was proposed by Councillor Glyn Carpenter and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the revised recommendation to approve:

Councillors Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Paul Inicki, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

68/P Application Number: 14/0382 - 6 Lanark Close, Frimley, Camberley GU16 8SP - Parkside Ward

This application was for the erection of garden decking to a height of 1.34m, a 1.22m picket fence and a closed panel fence at 1.52m in height.

The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, at the request of a local ward councillor it had been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Some Members were concerned about the height of the decking and the overlooking nature of the structure.

Resolved that application 14/0382 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head - Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Committee Members had received correspondence relating to this application.

Note 2

The application was proposed by Councillor Glyn Carpenter and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse:

Councillors Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

69/P Application Number: 14/0526 - 9-17 High Street, Chobham, Woking GU24 8AD - Chobham Ward

This application was for the change of use of unit 9 from A1 (Retail) to A3 (Restaurant/Cafe) with associated alterations to existing windows and doors.

Members were advised of the following updates:

Resolved that application 14/0526 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Pat Tedder declared that she knew the applicant from years ago but was not a close personal friend.

Note 2

The application was proposed by Councillor Pat Tedder and seconded by Councillor Paul Ilnicki.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse:

Councillors Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

70/P Application Number 14/0764 - unit 1 and 2, 23 Salisbury Grove, Mytchett, Camberley GU16 6BP - Mytchett and Deepcut Ward

This application was for the change of use from Class B1 (Offices) to Class D1 (Non-residential Institution) to provide day services for the disabled, with associated alterations. (Additional info received 29/9/14)

Resolved that application 14/0764 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:

Councillors Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Paul Inicki, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

71/P Any Other Business

The Chairman reminded Members about a scheduled Planning Training session on 3 November 2014.

The Chairman also advised the Committee that Paul Sherman would be leaving the Council to take up employment at Guildford Borough Council. The Chairman and Committee Members thanked Paul for all his hard work and wished him well in his new job.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 17 November 2014

- + Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
- Cllr Glyn Carpenter (Vice Chairman)

- | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| + Cllr David Allen | + Cllr Ken Pedder |
| + Cllr Richard Brooks | + Cllr Audrey Roxburgh |
| + Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Ian Sams |
| + Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr Pat Tedder |
| Cllr Surinder Gandhum | - Cllr Judi Trow |
| Cllr David Hamilton | + Cllr Valerie White |
| + Cllr David Mansfield | + Cllr John Winterton |

- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Rodney Bates for Cllr Judi Trow

In Attendance: Cllr Adrian Page, Cllr Bob Paton and Cllr Wynne Price (Cllrs Page and Price from min 72/P to 74/P and Cllr Paton from 72/P to 76/P)

Officers in attendance: Lee Brewin, Michelle Fielder, Gareth John, Jessica Harris-Hooton, Aneta Mantio, Shane O'Donnell, Jonathan Partington, Jenny Rickard, Chenge Taruvinga, Paul Watts.

72/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

73/P Application Number: 14/0249 - 17 Queens Road, (formerly Bisley Office Furniture), Bisley, Woking GU24 9RB - Bisley Ward

This application was for the erection of 113 dwellings with new access from Snowdrop Way and Chatton Row, internal roads, footways, parking, landscaping, open space with other associated works following demolition of the existing factory buildings and areas of hardstanding. (Additional information rec'd 22/09/14), (Amended plans & info rec'd 20/10/14).

There had been a site visit at the proposed site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Twelve additional letters of objection have been received concerned with the following issues:

1. *Proposed access – the existing access from Queens Road is the preferred option. BPC highlights that an application to the Planning Inspectorate was made to use the existing access for a residential use.*

Officer's comments: The alternative access from Queens Road is not subject to the current application. The applicant seeks planning permission with a single access from Snowdrop Way and this has been considered only.

2. *Housing mix & affordable housing*

Officer's comments: The proposal includes a variety of residential units from 1-bedroom to 5-bedroom. The Housing Manager is satisfied that the proposed mix is acceptable.

3. *Impact on the Thames Basin Heath SPA*

Officer's comments: The development cannot commence until the SANG, the relevant mitigation of the likely impacts on the TBH SPA, is in place, which is secured by condition No. 3. The legal agreement in terms of SAMM is an additional measure to the SANG and relates to the management and monitoring of the SPA.

4. *Representation letters*

Officer's comments: 2 letters of support have been received – on 30/09 and on 09/10.

5. *Site visit*

Officer's comments: Members and officers visited the site.

6. *All the other matters raised have been addressed in the report to the Committee or above.*

7. *Condition 3 – to be reworded as follows:*

No development shall take place until written confirmation has been obtained from the LPA in agreement with Natural England that the applicant has secured a SANG in perpetuity (including its management plan); and no dwelling shall be occupied before written confirmation has been obtained from the LPA that the works required to bring the land up to acceptable SANG standard have been completed.

Reason: To comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012; saved Policy NRM6 (Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area) of the South East Plan; and, the Surrey Heath Borough Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

8. *Condition 4 – to be reworded as follows:*

No development works shall commence until the applicant has secured and undertaken relocation of the watercourse to the southern end of the site, on or off the application site; with full details of the proposed design of the watercourse, timetable for delivery and maintenance agreement submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to manage flood risk and to comply with Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

9. *Condition 9 – A survey has been submitted by the applicant and therefore the amended condition should read:*

The Oak T29, as identified on plan R.0324_03-A received on 20/10/2014, should be replaced with plant 1no of Quercus robur tree within 2m of the tree to be removed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development. The tree shall have minimum stem size of 20 - 25 cm girth [nominal diameter of 7.2cm] at 1m from ground level, of a minimum overall planted height of 4.0 – 6.0m and having a substantially straight stem and Semi Mature tree as specified in BS 3936. Replacement planting shall conform to the British Standard for Nursery Stock as set out in BS 3936, Parts 1 to 5. Handling, planting and establishment of trees shall be in accordance with BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape. If any replacement planting planted in accordance to this condition die or become seriously damaged or diseased within a period of five years of the date of first occupation of the development, it shall be replaced as soon as practicable with another tree of similar size and species.

Reasons: To maintain the landscape character and profile of the area and to establish a tree which, in time, will replace the loss of amenity which was afforded by the tree, which is to be removed and to maintain the landscape character of the area to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Additional conditions to be imposed in terms of contamination:

Condition 32:

Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation must not commence until conditions 1 to 4 have been complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority in writing until condition 4 has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

1.1 Site Characterisation

An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it

originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:

- human health,*
- property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,*
- adjoining land,*
- groundwaters and surface waters,*
- ecological systems,*
- archeological sites and ancient monuments;*

(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

1.2. Submission of Remediation Scheme

A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

1.3. Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

1.4. Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition 1.1, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 1.2, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 1.3.

1.5. Long Term Monitoring and Maintenance

A monitoring and maintenance scheme to include monitoring the long-term effectiveness of the proposed remediation over a period of 5 years, and the provision of reports on the same must be prepared, both of which are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of the measures identified in that scheme and when the remediation objectives have been achieved, reports that demonstrate the effectiveness of the monitoring and maintenance carried out must be produced, and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

Reason (common to all): To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework'.

Some Members raised the following:

- i) Traffic congestion from increased number of cars parking in Snowdrop Way;
- ii) Concerns regarding HGVs using Snowdrop Way and space for passing;
- iii) Loss of children's right to play in Snowdrop Way;
- iv) Loss of commercial site;
- v) Consideration to be given to change the access to Queens Road – Members were advised that this land was not currently owned by the applicant and could not be part of the application, although negotiations were being undertaken under section 38 with the Secretary of State;
- vi) Deferral of the application – Members were advised that the application had to be determined at the meeting as any change in the access would mean the application would have to be resubmitted with new plans and another consultation process. The applicant could then hold the Council to account for non-determination within the statutory period.
- i) Paragraph 7.8.12 stated that the Surrey Fire Service recommended that parking enforcement be introduced due to residents' concerns regarding access for emergency vehicles – this contradicted the County Highways Agency's comments at paragraph 7.8.3. Members expressed disappointment that a representative from the County Highways Agency was not present at the meeting particularly as this was for a major application with significant highways implications. It was agreed that a letter be sent by the chief executive of the Council to the chief executive of Surrey County Council expressing this disappointment.

The officers had recommended that the application be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head –Regulatory and the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement. After consideration of the officers' recommendation, the Committee was of the opinion that the application had not provided sufficient evidence on traffic issues in Snowdrop Way and the impact on the residential amenity.

Resolved that application 14/0249 be refused on the grounds that the application had not provided sufficient evidence with regard to the traffic concerns and the impact on the residential amenity, the wording to be finalised after consultation with the Chairman.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor David Mansfield had been an employee of Bisley Office Equipment some years ago. He also attended meetings in relation to the consultation process as an observer and did not take part in any discussion.

It was also noted for the record that councillors had received letters from Bisley Parish Council and residents in relation to this application.

Note 2

As this application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mrs James representing the Snowdrop Residents' Association spoke in objection. Mr Smith and Mr Holden (representing the Bisley Residents' Association) also shared a speaking slot and spoke in objection.

Mr Hutchison, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks.

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:
Councillors Rodney Bates and Richard Brooks.

Voting against the recommendation to approve:
Councillors David Allen, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

The vote was lost.

The recommendation to refuse was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton

Voting against the recommendation to approve:
Councillors Rodney Bates and Richard Brooks.

The vote was carried.

74/P Application Number: 14/0605 - Frimhurst Farm, Deepcut Bridge Road, Deepcut GU16 6RF - Mytchett and Deepcut Ward

The application was for the application relating to the continued use of the existing Industrial Centre for use classes B1, B2 and B8 and movement between these uses as well as a revised vehicular access onto Deepcut Bridge Road.

Some Members felt that the proposal catered for a variety of employment types in the area and refusal of the application would cause a loss of local jobs and have a detrimental impact on the local economy. Officers reminded Members that while the reuse of buildings within the historic core of the site may be acceptable, the proliferation of compound areas and the creation of a new access in the countryside would harm its intrinsic character, beauty, and landscape quality.

Resolved that application 14/0605 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Andrews, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Ken Pedder.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse:

Councillors Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse:

Councillors David Allen, Colin Dougan and Pat Tedder.

75/P Application Number: 14/0675 - The Brickmakers Arms, Chertsey Road, Windlesham GU20 6HT - Windlesham Ward

The application was for the erection of a detached building and ancillary storage shed to provide additional accommodation to the existing public house and the extension of the car park with associated landscape alterations (retrospective).

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, at the request of a local ward councillor it had been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The committee report contains two errors;

- 1. It states that Windlesham Parish Council has no objection, this is incorrect, an objection has been raised on the basis there are no very special circumstances to justify the retention of the buildings in the Green Belt. The Parish Council also raise concerns as to whether the parking facilities are sufficient to meet the demand of the public house and the new facility.*
- 2. Para 7.1 the word 'locally' is omitted from the first sentence.*

Officers have had sight of the material circulated to members (by the agent) in advance of this meeting).'

In addition the Committee was advised that there was an error in the report and Windlesham Parish Council had raised an objection to the proposal.

Some concerns were raised with regard to the planning permission of the previous out buildings and the mobile home still on the site. In addition the traffic and car parking issues were discussed.

It was noted that the erected detached building used as a function room, catered for the local community by providing a venue for various groups. This improved the vitality of the business and the village. It was suggested a condition could be added to limit the function room to community use only.

It was suggested that the application be deferred so that further discussions could take place with the applicant with regard to the use of the function room.

Resolved that application 14/0675 be deferred to allow for further discussions to take place with the applicant, with regard to the use of the function room.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Sapstead spoke in objection; he also spoke in objection on behalf of Lord Russell who was unable to attend at short notice. Mr Andrews, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Note 2

The recommendation to defer the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to defer the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to defer:

Councillor Rodney Bates.

76/P Application Number: 14/0609 - Brook Green, Waverley Close, Camberley GU15 1JH - Parkside Ward

The application was for the outline application for the erection of two detached buildings, each to contain 9 two bedroom flats following the demolition of the existing buildings (Matters of access, layout and scale to be considered.) (Additional info rec'd 21/10/2014).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'One additional representation of objection and one representation of support have been received.'

The objection raised the following concerns:

- *increased traffic and potential parking issues*
- *loss of trees and vegetation which is harmful to the character of the area'*

In addition the sentence in paragraph 7.5.2 starting with 'moreover' should read:

'Moreover the scale and siting of the buildings, with the access drive running between the buildings and formal parking arrangement, would give rise to a form of development which would appear significantly at odds with the existing development in Waverley Close.'

Resolved that application 14/0609 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Audrey Roxburgh.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

77/P Application Number: 14/0794 - Alenia Marconi, Lyon Way, Frimley, GU16 7EX - Frimley Ward

The application was for the erection of a gas fuelled, Short Term Operating Reserve electricity generation plant.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The LPA has been notified of a change in the planning agent acting for the applicant.

4 representations of objection have been received which raise the following matters:

- *Increase in noise, dirt, pollution and vibrations already experienced by residential properties in the area; (Officer note: the proposal's impact on residential amenities is considered in section 7.5 of the committee report)*
- *The proposal is too close to residential properties (Officer note: this would be a matter for the Health and Safety Executive)*
- *Object to the principle of any development on the site on flooding grounds (Officer note: the site is part of an allocated employment site and benefits from planning permission for redevelopment, in addition the EA has not raised any flood related objection to the proposal which is supported by an up to date flood risk assessment)*

Point of clarification – The Environmental Health Officer has considered the proposals impact in terms of noise, contamination and air pollution.

The application is supported by a noise assessment, air quality assessment and contaminated land assessment.

In respect of noise, the assessment considers the impact of the proposal on the nearest properties located in Station Road. In his assessment of the robustness of the Noise Assessment, the EHO notes:

- *No sound is produced when the plant is not on line;*
- *Experience of this type of plant indicates that operating times are likely to be 1900-2100 (season and demand dependant);*
- *Plant will be online typically 83mins a day (subject to caveat above);*
- *On the basis of the 35Db(A) silencers proposed by the applicant complaints are unlikely (increase in noise over background levels being 1Db(A)), however this can be improved by the use of 45Db(A). The use of these improved silencers will reduce the difference between sound produced and background noise levels to Zero. This is conditioned, condition 5 of the report*

In summary the EHO concludes:

1. *Noise levels from the plant will not cause the standards detailed within BS8233:14 to be exceeded within bed, dining and living rooms of the nearest residential properties.*
2. *Noise levels from the plant will be below day, evening and night time background levels within bed, dining and living rooms for the nearest residential property. Allowing for the same to have a partially open window for ventilation purposes.*
3. *Noise levels from this power plant are less than was predicted to arise from the same unit in the distribution, trading or warehouse scheme.*

No objection is raised on land contamination grounds and a standard condition is proposed (condition 6).

In terms of air quality, the submitted air quality assessment predictions are based on a worst case scenario of the plant being on line for 1500hrs per year (not the predicted 800hrs). The EHO concludes that air quality issues can be controlled by condition and are not a constraint to the proposed development.

An additional condition (detailed below) is however proposed to deal with dust generation during the construction phase:

8. Prior to the development hereby approved commencing a Dust Management Plan (DMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The details to be submitted should include:

- *measures for the mitigation and control of dust from the site construction operations and include details of any monitoring scheme,*
- *measures to ensure contact details for appropriate persons are displayed on the site boundary,*
- *means of observing wind speed and direction prior to conducting any dust generating operations during periods of high or gusty wind*
- *establishment and enforcement of appropriate speed limits on site during the construction period to prevent dust being whipped up*
- *Water assisted dust sweepers to be used on access roads and local roads to remove any material tracked out of the site*
- *Measures to avoid the dry sweeping or large areas*
- *All loads to be covered entering and leaving the site*
- *Water to be used as a dust suppressant*

Reason: To comply with the guidance produced by the Institute of Air Quality Management, Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 212 and the NPPF.'

Some Members sought clarification on the noise levels but were advised that Environmental Services had raised no objection as the noise levels could be compared to that of talking in a library.

In addition clarification was sought on the phrase 'short term' in the description 'short term operative reserve'. The Committee was advised that short term related to the operation during the day. Some Members requested that a definition of 'short term' could be included in the resolution.

Resolved that application 14/0794 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen and Ian Sams.

78/P

Application Number: 14/0799 - Burwood House Hotel, 15 London Road, Camberley GU15 3UQ - St Pauls Ward

The application was for the erection of side and rear extensions with associated internal alterations following conversion of hotel into 10 residential flats (one 3 bedroom, eight 2 bedroom and one 1 bedroom). (Amended plans rec'd 24/10/14).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Further viability information has been submitted and the levels of contributions have yet to be agreed as a result; however the recommendation in respect of this application remains to defer and delegate subject to the satisfactory negotiation and completion of an agreement in respect of infrastructure, SPA and affordable housing by the 27th of November.'

Some Members were concerned about traffic issues and the low provision of affordable housing.

Resolved that application 14/0799 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor David Allen.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

79/P Application Number: 14/0735 - Pembroke House, Pembroke Broadway, Camberley - Town Ward

The application was for the erection of a 92 bedroom residential carehome following the demolition of existing office building. (Amended plans rec'd 09/10/2014)

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Point of clarification: parking provision for this development. Para. 1.1 and 4.4 should read 31 car spaces in the basement, 10 cycle spaces and 2 disabled bays on the ground floor as well as one minibus bay. A revised consultation response from the Highway Authority to reflect this has been also received.'

Resolved that application 14/0735 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor David Allen.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

80/P Application Number: 14/0870 - 45 Deepcut Bridge Road, Deepcut, GU16 6QT - Mytchett and Deepcut Ward

The application was for the erection of 3 detached two storey dwellings following demolition of existing bungalow.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'A satisfactory legal agreement was received and therefore the recommendation is Grant subject to conditions.'

Resolved that application 14/0870 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Audrey Roxburgh.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

81/P Application Number: 14/0837 - 29 - 29a Portesbury Road, Camberley GU15 3TA - Town Ward

The application was for the change of use from garage/workshop/office to residential, together with the erection of two storey side and single storey rear extensions following the demolition of detached garage to the rear to provide a single dwelling.

Members were advised that a consultation response had been received from Environmental Services regarding contamination issues; no objection had been raised subject to a standard contamination condition being included.

'Additional conditions to be imposed in terms of contamination:

Condition 32:

Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation must not commence until conditions 1 to 4 have been complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority in writing until condition 4 has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

1.1 Site Characterisation

An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:

- human health,*
- property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,*
- adjoining land,*
- groundwaters and surface waters,*
- ecological systems,*
- archeological sites and ancient monuments;*

(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

1.2. Submission of Remediation Scheme

A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

1.3. Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

1.4. Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition 1.1, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 1.2, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 1.3.

1.5. Long Term Monitoring and Maintenance

A monitoring and maintenance scheme to include monitoring the long-term effectiveness of the proposed remediation over a period of 5 years, and the provision of reports on the same must be prepared, both of which are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of the measures identified in that scheme and when the remediation objectives have been achieved, reports that demonstrate the effectiveness of the monitoring and maintenance carried out must be produced, and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

Reason (common to all): To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. ‘

Resolved that application 14/0837 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

82/P Application Number: 14/0710 - 22 Worsley Road, Frimley, GU16 9AU - Frimley Green Ward

The application was for the erection of a two storey side extension to comprise 2 one bedroom flats with the retention of the existing property on a reduced curtilage.

Members were advised of the following update:

‘Thames Valley Water – No objection’.

In addition the Committee was advised that an email had been received by officers from the applicant outlining the proposal would provide a needed variety of units in the area.

Resolved that application 14/0710 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Ken Pedder.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

**83/P Application Number: 14/0887 - The Sun, 45 High Street, Chobham GU24
8AF - Chobham Ward**

The application was for the application for Advertisement Consent for 2 illuminated fascia signs, 1 illuminated hanging sign, 1 illuminated title sign, 2 non-illuminated other signs and 1 illuminated menu sign all replacing existing signage.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Chobham Parish Council – Objection 'All external Lighting to be heritage in keeping with the High Street''

Some Members were concerned about the bulkhead lighting and felt signs should be lit from outside and not within the light units. It was agreed that this would be covered by the inclusion of an additional informative.

Resolved that application 14/0887 be approved as amended subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Ian Sams and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

**84/P Application Number: 14/0876 - The Sun, 45 High Street, Chobham, GU24
8AF - Chobham Ward**

The application was for the Listed Building Consent for the advertisement for 2 illuminated fascia signs, 1 illuminated hanging sign, 1 illuminated title sign, 2 non-illuminated other signs and 1 illuminated menu sign all replacing existing signs.

Some Members were concerned about the bulkhead lighting and felt signs should be lit from outside and not within the light units. It was agreed that this would be covered by the inclusion of an additional informative.

Resolved that application 14/0876 be approved as amended subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Valerie White and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the
Performance and Audit Scrutiny
Committee - Scrutiny Meeting held at
Surrey Heath House on 24 September
2014**

+ Cllr John May (Chairman)
+ Cllr David Allen (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Tim Dodds	+ Cllr Joanne Potter
- Cllr Alastair Graham	+ Cllr Wynne Price
- Cllr Beverley Harding	+ Cllr Audrey Roxburgh
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
- Cllr Paul Ilnicki	+ Cllr Alan Whittart
- Cllr Lexie Kemp	+ Cllr John Winterton
+ Cllr Chris Pitt	

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Liane Gibson (substitute for Cllr Beverley Harding) and Cllr Ian Sams (substitute for Cllr Paul Ilnicki)

Officers in Attendance: Andrew Crawford, Julia Hutley-Savage and Kelvin Menon.

24/P Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman reported that the Council's External Auditors, KPMG, would not be in attendance, but that the Executive Head of Finance would address any Member questions.

25/P Minutes

The minutes of the Scrutiny meeting of the Committee, held on 23 July 2014, were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

26/P Matters Arising

Minute 019/P – Members asked the officers to establish when the reference on the Arena 2016 Working Group would be considered by the Executive.

27/P Scrutiny of Portfolio Holders - Regulatory

Councillor Keith Bush summarised some of the issues and challenges facing his Portfolio, including the impact of benefit changes in London, leading to an outward migration. He suggested that the Council needed a mix of land use to help promote sustainable communities. There was a clear demand for 2 bedroom properties and residential accommodation within the Town Centre.

The newly created Family Support Service, whilst in its infancy was already showing signs of success.

One issue, which would impacted on previously identified potential housing developments was the increase in car ownership per household.

Generally, businesses in the Borough were recovering well from the financial crisis, but, it was also noted that many modern businesses would need to utilise their units 24 hours a day.

In terms of SANGS, Members and Officers continued to work with landowners and members of the public to identify suitable sites.

Drainage regulations had been recently changed, putting much more responsibility on Surrey County Council and reducing the input and the control that this Council had previously exercised.

Members highlighted the need for a balance between housing and industry, particularly for the Villages. It was suggested that, given the scarcity of residential building land and the pressure from the Government to generate new-build, it might be necessary, at some point in the future, to review housing densities.

The Home-swap Day had been considered a success with 91 families attending and up to 40 families potentially finding a match. However, there continued to be a shortage of accommodation in the Borough for young single people.

Resolved, that the presentation be noted.

28/P Complaints and Complaints to the Local Government Ombudsman

The Complaints Officer reported on complaints received in 2013/14, the outcomes, lessons learned and complaints submitted to the Local Government Ombudsman. She drew comparisons to 2012/13 data and emphasised that the report focussed on Stage 2 and 3 complaints. Under Stage 1, complaints were normally dealt with informally by the service area and within a working day.

Of the 17 complaints received at Stages 2 or 3 in 2013/14, 16 were unjustified and one, in relation to a freedom of information request for which no acknowledgment had been received, was partly justified.

The Local Government Ombudsman had received 17 complaints relating to this Council. Of these, 8 were closed after initial investigation, 7 were referred back to this organisation for local resolution and 2 had been upheld.

Members recognised that the low number of Stage 2 or 3 complaints reflected the high quality and efforts of the Complaints Officer and Council staff.

Resolved, that the report and data on complaints for the period 2013/14 be noted.

29/P Annual Report on the Treasury Management Service and Actual Prudential Indicators

The Executive Head of Finance presented a report on the performance of the Treasury Management Service, including compliance with the 2013/14 Prudential Indicators.

Returns from investments continued to be low due to the ongoing low bank base rate. Members suggested that the Council's investments were too risk averse and short term. However, following on from advice from the Council's treasury advisors, a paper was being presented to the Executive on 30 September to address these issues, by broadening the range of investments the Council could invest in, thereby improving returns.

Members supported proposals to use treasury funds to aid economic development through peer to peer lending, with a view to increasing returns. The Executive Head of Finance agreed to bring a report to a future meeting on "Funding Circle" peer to peer lending, for members to consider.

Resolved, that

- (i) the report on Treasury Management, including compliance with the 2013/14 Prudential Indicators, be noted;**
- (ii) the Executive be advised to recommend that Council note the report on Treasury Performance for 2013/14 including compliance with the Prudential Indicators; and**
- (iii) a report on peer to peer lending be submitted to a future Committee meeting.**

30/P Financial Accounts Sign Off and External Auditor's ISO 260 Report

The Committee considered a report on the audited financial statements for 2013/14 and the External Auditor's report (ISO260) for 2013/14.

The Chairman reported that, as the external auditors (KPMG) had been unable to attend the meeting, he had held discussions with them prior to the meeting, on the Council's financial performance in terms of procedures and recording.

KPMG had indicated that the Accounts had been well maintained and that they had received all the assistance needed from officers. They had highlighted a number of areas where clear improvements had been achieved, noting only small issues around timing.

The Committee expressed concern at the late arrival of the hard copy of the KPMG report, given that Members were being asked to take decisions based on the opinions contained therein. Members were asked to review the report and to feed back any comments to the Executive Head of Finance as a matter of urgency.

Members emphasised the need for the Council to get the best use out of its assets. It was noted that, following recalculations resulting from revaluation challenges, the localisation of business rates would result in no additional funding.

In respect of pensions, Members noted that the reported underfunding was predicated on the scheme ending and all the pension liabilities crystallising at once. Future liabilities were calculated with reference to the return on Gilts and as these were low, this increased the value of liabilities. Contributions were set by actuaries following a triennial review which took place for the year ended March 2013.

Resolved that

- (i) the Executive Head of Finance and the Chairman of the Committee be authorised to sign the Letter of Representation on behalf of the Council;**
- (ii) the amendment to the Annual Governance Statement, as outlined in the committee report, be agreed;**
- (iii) the audited financial statements for 2013/14 be received and that the Chairman of the Committee approves the financial statements on behalf of the Council; and**
- (iv) the auditor's report including the fact that the Auditors propose to issue an unqualified audit report and value for money conclusion on the Financial Statements for 2013/14 be noted.**

31/P Committee Work Programme 2014/15

The Committee noted the work programme for the remainder of 2014/15.

The Principal Solicitor reported that an update on Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 inspection and surveillance would be submitted to the Audit element of the Committee's January 2015 meeting.

The Chairman urged Members to submit their Fraud returns as part of the Council's compliance requirements.

Members noted the previous decision to receive a report on Peer to Peer Lending.

RESOLVED, that the Committee Work Programme for 2014/15, attached at Annex A and as amended, be agreed.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the
Performance and Audit Scrutiny
Committee - Scrutiny Meeting held at
Surrey Heath House on 5 November
2014**

+ Cllr John May (Chairman)
+ Cllr David Allen (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Tim Dodds	+ Cllr Joanne Potter
+ Cllr Alastair Graham	+ Cllr Wynne Price
+ Cllr Beverley Harding	+ Cllr Audrey Roxburgh
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Paul Ilnicki	+ Cllr Alan Whittart
- Cllr Lexie Kemp	+ Cllr John Winterton
- Cllr Chris Pitt	

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Andrew Crawford, Julia Hutley-Savage and Kelvin Menon

32/P Minutes

The minutes of the Scrutiny meeting of the Committee, held on 24 September 2014, were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

33/P Treasury Management Mid-Year Report

The Executive Head of Finance reported on the performance of the Treasury Management Service and compliance with the Prudential Indicators for the period to 30 September 2014.

The original Treasury Management Strategy had been agreed by the Council in February 2014 and was in place for the period covered by this report. A new strategy was approved on the 1st October 2014 with a view to increasing investment returns.

The Executive Head of Finance reported that for 2014/15, the Council had no borrowing commitments to date and it was not anticipated that this would be necessary for the remainder of the financial year, unless an opportunity for investment in property arose, in which case, a separate paper would be brought forward to the Executive and Council. It was, however, anticipated that the Council could have a capital financing requirement of at least £4 million over the next three years.

In terms of the Council's current investments, security of capital had been the main objective until the revision of the Strategy in October 2014, to recognise that investment returns must also be an objective, even if this increased risk. The Counterparty credit quality of the Council's investments currently had a credit rating of A+.

The Council had sought to balance risk against return by diversifying across a wide range of banks and building societies, but the recent changes to the strategy had permitted the range of investments to be broadened to include property and corporate bond funds which, whilst carrying increased risk, offered better returns, particularly for longer term investment.

Members noted issues which would potentially impact on the Council's investment options, including:

- (i) The European Union Bank Recovery and Resolution Directive (BRRD) – Under this directive, in the event of a bank failing, the Government could order that, for non-retail investors with deposits, a percentage of their funds be converted into shares, thus limiting the risk to Government, but increasing risk to depositors. It was considered likely that the UK Government would put pressure on banks to bolster their capital buffers and would look to accelerate the adoption BRRD and therefore the bail-out implications thereof;
- (ii) Credit Agencies - Changes to the credit agencies outlook for European banks, announced in April 2014 and British banks in August 2014 could see a number of institutes downgraded. Arling Close, the Council's Treasury Advisors had recommended that the Council amend the Treasury Strategy to permit investment in BBB+ British banks and building societies for a maximum period of 100 days;
- (iii) Scottish Independence Referendum – It was likely that promises made during the referendum campaign would impact on all areas of the UK;
- (iv) Eurozone – Continued weakness of the Eurozone economies, with poor growth and high unemployment, would impact on the UK economy and investment opportunities; and
- (v) Instability – Gilt yields had been negatively affected by market reactions to geo-political risk elsewhere in the world.

The Council's Treasury Advisors had speculated that the Bank Rate could rise as early as Quarter 3 of 2015, but that the rates would rise slowly and to a lower level than in the past.

As a result of the revision to the Treasury Management Strategy, the Council was reducing its holdings of bank deposits and moving into other investment funds. Investment had already been made with the CCLA Property (£2 million, with a 5% indicative rate of return), as well as a number of corporate property funds. The Council would look to invest in equity funds as current deposits matured.

Members noted that ongoing advice on the investment environment would be sought from the Council's Treasury Advisors, Arling Close, as the Council did not, and would not, have that sort of expertise in-house.

Funding Circle – The Executive Head of Finance reported that he had sought further advice from Arling Close on peer to peer funding and he would submit an

update at a future meeting. Runnymede and Tandridge Councils had invested in peer to peer funding, but had set a geographical limit of the South East of England, as restricting investments to the borough or even Surrey only would prove extremely restrictive, increasing risk whilst decreasing the potential return.

Members suggested that the Council consider a focus on the Blackwater Valley rather than limit any proposals to Surrey alone and to look to include the South East of England if a smaller catchment area proved restrictive.

The Committee considered that the Council should encourage local businesses to engage with peer to peer lending such as provided by Funding Circle. Given the improved high speed internet availability in the Borough, Members suggested that the Council should consider investing in small business units, particularly for start-up initiatives, involving short term rental or leasing arrangements.

The Executive Head of Finance reported that the Council already had a property acquisition policy in place and that the primary objective of property investment had to be financial return in order to support services. Members supported the view of purchasing property to facilitate business growth and suggested that the Finance and Asset Management Working Group meet, to focus on property options.

Resolved, that

- (i) the report be noted;**
- (ii) the Executive be advised to**
 - (a) recommend to the Council that the Treasury Strategy be amended to permit investment in BBB+ rated British banks and building societies for a maximum of 100 days;**
 - (b) schedule a meeting of the Finance and Asset Management Working Group or a sub-group thereof, to urgently focus on property acquisition options including those that deliver economic development; and**
 - c) for future reports, Annex A, listing investments, should include a column on interest rates achieved.**
 - (c) recommend to the Council that the treasury strategy be amended to permit investment in BBB+ rated British banks and building societies for a maximum of 100 days;**
 - (d) Encourage local businesses to investigate options on peer to peer lending such as the Funding Circle;**
 - (e) Investigate options on property acquisition to establish a hub for small start-up businesses, typically IT driven;**

(f) **Re-convene the Finance and Asset Management Working Group or a sub-group thereof, to urgently focus on property acquisition options; and**

(iii) **For future reports, Annex A, listing investments, should include a column on interest rates achieved.**

34/P Expenditure on Professional Advisors

The Committee considered a report detailing expenditure incurred on professional advisors for the 6 months to 30 September 2014.

The report analysed expenditure incurred above £500 and was broken down into the type of advice given, together with the names of the advisors and a brief explanation of the service purchased.

Members noted that the total expenditure, at £109k, was up from £77k in the previous year but that just over half of the current expenditure related to work on the Town Centre redevelopment.

Resolved, that the report for the six months up to 30 September 2014 be noted.

35/P Updates from Member Panels

Councillor David Allen reported that the Grants Member Panel, which also included Councillors Alastair Graham and Tim Dodds, had investigated what sort of grants were available, what could be targeted by the Council, the ease with which they could be accessed, how the Council could acquire them and what software was available to assist in this process. The Panel had ascertained that grants fell in to 5 broad categories as follows:

- (i) Activities and Health Activities – There were a significant number of grants available for physical fitness and health;
- (ii) Environmental improvements;
- (iii) Education – These focussed on skills in high-tech areas. All benefits, by 2017 have to be acquired electronically over the internet, so there were a whole raft of grants available to facilitate this;
- (iv) Community; and
- (v) Green Energy.

The Panel had decided that it would be better to focus on a couple of areas where the greatest potential outcome could be achieved for minimum resource implications, those being:

Activity Related Grants – Councillor Allen reported that the English Rugby Football Union had given a long term commitment to using the Pennyhill Park Hotel

Complex as its training headquarters. The hotel had also been adopted as the training base for American Football Teams playing at Wembley Stadium. It was considered possible that, in the near future, an American Football franchise could be based in the UK.

Camberley and Chobham Rugby Football Clubs already had coaches in place as part of the build up to the Rugby World Cup and, in the lead up to that tournament, which would commence in September 2015, the Council would have the opportunity to showcase the Borough and attract grants to develop facilities and grass roots sports in the Borough. However, there would be only a short window of opportunity, with the need to focus on activity, outdoor activity and healthy activity.

Environmental Grants – The Member Panel had identified opportunities in Frimley Green and Mytchett, focussing in particular on Frimley Lodge Park and the Basingstoke Canal.

Councillor Innicki highlighted difficulties facing the Basingstoke Canal Society, noting that any funding which could be achieved could assist in the future of this initiative.

Councillor Allen highlighted areas in the Bagshot locality which would need improvements if the Borough was to be fully showcased during the rugby world cup and subsequently.

Councillor Whittart focused on staff development opportunities and the advantage of developing in-house skills to achieve the maximum outcome from the grant application process.

The Committee noted that the opportunity to attract rugby world cup related grants would have tight timescales attached. To achieve a sufficient return, the Council would need to commit resources.

Whilst it was recognised that grant application work would have to compete with other Council priorities, Members strongly supported making the most of the specific opportunity relating to the Rugby World Cup as well as developing in-house skills and purchasing grant application software to maximise the return for the resources committed.

Councillor Allen reported that, whilst he would be willing to assist in future considerations of grant applications, the Panel had now completed the task set by the Committee.

Resolved that the Executive be advised to

- (i) allocate officer and financial resources to enable the Council to proactively seek Activity based grants linked to the Rugby World Cup and Environmental Grants linked to Frimley Lodge Park and surrounding area; and**

- (ii) **take action to use the fact that the England Rugby Team train in the borough as a way to promote the Borough during the Rugby World Cup.**

36/P Committee Work Programme 2014/15

The Committee noted the work programme for the remainder of 2014/15.

Members noted the previous decision to receive an update at the next meeting on Peer to Peer Lending.

RESOLVED, that the Committee Work Programme for 2014/15, attached at Annex A and as amended, be agreed.

Chairman

**PERFORMANCE AND AUDIT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
WORK PROGRAMME 2014/15**

DATE	TOPIC	REPORT AUTHOR
-------------	--------------	----------------------

28 January 2015

P&A (Audit)

1	Annual Audit Plan	Alex Middleton
2	Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 Update	Julia Hutley-Savage
3	Audit Recommendations	Alex Middleton

28 January 2015

P&A (Scrutiny)

1	Scrutiny of Portfolio Holders	Kelvin Menon
2	Corporate Risk Register	Kelvin Menon
3	Certification of Claims and Returns	Kelvin Menon
4	Committee Work Programme	Kelvin Menon

25 March 2015

P&A (Scrutiny)

1	Scrutiny of Portfolio Holders	Kelvin Menon
2	Third Quarter Finance Report	Kelvin Menon
3	Equalities – End of Year Update	Belinda Tam
4	Committee Work Programme 2014/15	Kelvin Menon

To be allocated:

Peer to Peer Lending/Investment Policy
Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 - Update

Minutes of a Meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 25 November 2014

+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Paul Deach (Vice Chairman)

Cllr Glyn Carpenter	- Cllr Ken Pedder
+ Cllr Ian Cullen	+ Cllr Chris Pitt
+ Cllr Tim Dodds	+ Cllr Ian Sams
- Cllr Liane Gibson	- Cllr Pat Tedder
Cllr David Hamilton	+ Cllr Alan Whittart
- Cllr Lexie Kemp	+ Cllr John Winterton
+ Cllr Adrian Page	

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Judi Trow (In place of Pat Tedder)

In Attendance: Sarah Groom and Andrew Crawford

12 Chairman's Announcements and Welcome to Guests

The Chairman welcomed Hilary Murgatroyd and Chris Ford from Thames Water and Paul Mooney and Rob Sage from Affinity Water.

13 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 16 September 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

14 Presentation by Affinity Water

Paul Mooney reported that Affinity Water was the largest water supply only company in the Region, employing 1,200 people to provide 900 million litres of water each day to 1.5 million properties and a population of approximately 3.5 million. The average annual bill was £174 in comparison to the industry average of £186.

Affinity controlled 16,500 kilometres of mains pipes, mainly under roads, renewing 1% of the pipes each year, at a cost of £18 million per annum. Some 20 kilometres of piping had been renewed in Surrey in 2014. It was expected that only 2.3 kilometres of piping would be targeted in 2015. However, the Company had commenced a large Trunk Main investigation including piping in Bagshot, Lightwater and West End. At this stage, the Company were carrying out a feasibility study and it would not be known for some time if any works were required.

The Company carried out rolling feasibility studies on failing assets, considering factors such as burst rates and environmental impact. Required work is then planned by a Design Team, who assess the area with local operatives, considering factors such as the proposals, risks and impact on communities.

Given that much of the mains piping is under main/trunk roads, the Team identify businesses, schools, religious and cultural groups and events that might be adversely impacted upon and consult them. Before work commences, Affinity will use newspaper adverts, social media and letters to MPs and Councillors, to give maximum publicity to proposals, timings and potential impacts.

Affinity work with the Highways Agency to coordinate with any other planned work and minimise disruption. Any work and the dates thereof are agreed with Highways and a permit issued three months in advance of the work commencing.

Members noted that Affinity would seek to recover the cost of any works needed during and/or resulting from the construction of HS2.

Referring to recent works on the London Road Bagshot, Mr Mooney explained that considerable pre-planning had taken place with Highways, resulting in the proposed start being put back from September to January. The proposed work had been re-assessed when the disruption to the local community and travelling public became clear and extra traffic management measures were brought in, at a cost of £300,000.

All water companies produce a 25 year water management plan and five year business plans. They consider predicted population, housing and environmental changes and then look at resources and any gaps between expected demand and supply. In the next five years, Affinity will lose significant resources to improve river flows, mainly in chalk rivers and primarily through Hertfordshire.

Mr Sage reported that only 40% of Affinity customers were 'metered'. Mr Mooney agreed to provide Members with a link to the site which detailed the roll-out of water meters to Affinity customer. Whilst the parts of the Borough supported by the Company would not be 'metered' till 2017, individuals could request a meter and one would be installed free of charge.

The relative benefits of metered and non-metered houses tended to depend on the size (and therefore rateable value) of properties and the numbers residing therein. Often, when meters were installed, leaks were identified and resolved based on the difference between water used and water flows recorded. For families who experienced significant increases in their bills through changing to a meter, Affinity would work with them to reduce usage.

Resolved, that the presentation be noted.

15 Presentation by Thames Water

Hilary Murgatroyd reported that Thames Water was the largest water and waste provider in the UK, providing 9 million clean water customers in London and the

Thames Valley. It had 350 sewage works treating 4.4 billion litres per day of waste water and had 67,000 miles of sewers, over 2,500 pumping stations and 1.2 million manholes. Recently, the Company became responsible for private lateral mains connecting semi-detached and terraced houses to the mains systems.

Thames Water was one of the cheapest providers, with customers paying an average of £1.01p per day.

Thames Water had a duty under the Water Industry Act 1991, to be responsible for sewerage. This included a duty to provide, clean and maintain public sewers and to provide and extend sewerage systems. Whilst responsible for foul water, surface water and combined sewers, the Company had no responsibilities to provide capacity for flood waters.

Members were reminded that, in 2007, adverse weather resulted in extensive flooding across the Region. Whilst Surrey Heath was affected, it was much less so than other areas covered by Thames Water.

The adverse weather, which started in December 2013 and ran into March 2014, caused the biggest flooding event in the Company's history, resulting in extensive inundation and an estimated 69,500 customers affected across the region. Many Thames Water assets were overwhelmed, including sewers, pumping stations and sewage treatment works. 900 of 2,500 pumping stations were overwhelmed but only four ceased to work.

In response to the flooding, Thames Water increased the number of tankers in the field from 20 to 100 and coped with an increased daily workload from 600 jobs to 1,200. When the response was assessed, Thames Water identified communications as an area needing strengthening. As a result, the number of customer representatives was increased in both clean and waste teams and a new customer service telephone system was introduced enabling more intelligent messaging for customers.

The number of staff in the field was also identified as a weak point. This year, in anticipation of a wet winter, festive cover would be increased from 50% to 70%.

In terms of local issues, Chris Ford identified two recent complaints relating to Lightwater properties and the remedial action taken. He reported on pollution to the River Blackwater in September 2012, resulting from a failure of Plant in the Camberley Sewage Treatment Works. Thames Water had pleaded guilty on 2 counts and sentencing would take place in January 2015. Chris Ford offered to brief Members at a later stage on the outcomes thereof.

Members noted that one of the issues resulting in the failure of machinery at the Camberley Sewage Treatment Works and an ongoing difficulty for Thames Water was the type and quantity of materials disposed through the sewers. Items which did not biodegrade, including wet wipes and kitchen fat/oil/grease contributed to up to half of blockages reported.

Thames Water had engaged in discussions with manufacturers such as Lever Brothers to either consider the make-up of their products, alert customers or both.

Another common issue was mis-connection of pipes so that clean and surface water is directed into foul water pipes that are not designed to cope with the volumes involved.

Members suggested that the Council could provide publicity on behalf of Thames Water through the Heathscene magazine. Hilary Murgatroyd agreed to liaise with the Media and Marketing Manager on appropriate messages. Members agreed to support the 'Bin It' campaign via social media.

RESOLVED, that the Media and Marketing Team be asked to publicise the 'Please bin it, don't block it' campaign.

16 Committee Work Programme

The Committee considered a report on the work programme for the remainder of the 2013/14 municipal year.

All other organisations invited to speak in this municipal year had confirmed their agreement.

RESOLVED, that the Work Programme for 2014/15, as attached at Annex A to these minutes, be agreed.

Chairman

External Partnerships Select Committee Work Programme – 2014/15

Date		Topic	Presenter/ Author
20 January 2015	1.	Crime and Disorder Update	Inspector John Davies
	2.	Police and Crime Panel	Cllr Charlotte Morley
	3.	Street Angels	Karen Kendall
	4.	Your Sanctuary	Fiamma Pather
3 March 2015	1.	Surrey Heath Health and Wellbeing Board	Tim Pashen
	2.	Frimley Park Hospital	TBC

To be allocated:

Collectively Camberley BID
EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership
Taxi Marshals

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff
Consultative Group held at Surrey
Heath House on 27 November 2014**

- + Geraldine Sharman (Chairman)
- + Cllr Ken Pedder (Vice Chairman)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cllr Liane Gibson - Cllr Moira Gibson + Cllr Josephine Hawkins + Cllr Paul Ilnicki + Cllr Charlotte Morley + Cllr Audrey Roxburgh + Cllr Judi Trow | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Andrew Edmeads + David McDermott + Lynn Smith + Anthony Sparks + Karen Wetherell - Rachel Whillis |
|--|--|

- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

13/J Notes

The Notes of the meeting of the Consultative Group held on 18 September 2014 were received and confirmed subject to Cllr Paul Ilnicki being shown as present at that meeting.

14/J Family Friendly Policies

The Group received updated documents in respect of the following Family Friendly Policies:

- The Maternity Policy
- The Paternity Policy
- The Adoption Policy
- The Parental Leave Policy
- The Shared Parental Leave Policy

These policies were designed to ensure that female employees, adoptive parents and fathers/partners did not suffer any detrimental treatment as a result of being pregnant or adopting a child.

The Group noted that following amendments to the Policies:

Page	Paragraph	Amendment
11	5	Last line – substitute “are” for “and”.
12	6.1.1	Add “the” before Surrey Heath Borough Council
13	6.1.7	Remove gap in first sentence.
	6.2	Substitute “ante-natal” for antenatal throughout.
	6.2.3	Second sentence, add “up to” before one or two appointments.

- | | | |
|----|-------|--|
| | 6.3.1 | Third sentence, substitute “the staff member” for “staff”.
Fifth sentence, substitute “the relevant staff member” for the relevant staff. |
| 25 | 8.3 | Number second paragraph. |
| 27 | 8.9.1 | First sentence substitute “adoption” for “maternity”.
Replace “SMP” and “SPP” with “SAP”. |
| 29 | 9.2 | Remove last bullet point. |
| 31 | 9.4 | Number paragraphs. |

The Group also noted that consideration would be given to replicating the second bullet point Paragraph 8.5.2 on page 26 in all the Family Friendly Policies.

Resolved that the Executive be asked to recommend to Council that, subject to the above amendments, the Family Friendly Policies and Procedures, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted.

15/J Work Programme

The Group received the work programme for the remainder of the 2014/15 municipal year and noted the topics allocated to each meeting.

Meeting	Topic	Source
22 January 2015	Pay Settlement	HR
	Pay Policy Statement	HR
19 March 2015	Social Media Policy	HR
	Recruitment Policy	HR

Resolved that the work programme for the remainder for the remainder of the 2014/15 municipal year be approved.

Chairman

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank